Class _____ Book _____

MURRAY LIBRARY

Presented by

_____

TRADITIONS AND BELIEFS OF ANCIENT ISRAEL

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

CRITICA BIBLICA

Demy 8vo. Cloth. Price **15s.** *net.*

OR MAY BE HAD IN SEPARATE PARTS, VIZ.

PART I.—Isaiah and Jeremiah, price **2s. 6d.** net.

PART II.—Ezekiel and Minor Prophets, price **3s.** net.

PART III.—The Books of Samuel, price **3s.** net.

PART IV.—The Books of Kings, price **3s.** net.

PART V.—Joshua and Judges, price **3s.** net.

PUBLISHED BY A. & C. BLACK, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON

TRADITIONS & BELIEFS

OF

ANCIENT ISRAEL

BY

T. K. CHEYNE, D.Litt., D.D.

ORIEL PROFESSOR OF THE INTERPRETATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE AT OXFORD
CANON OF ROCHESTER; FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

296
C42

LONDON
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK
1907

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/traditionsbelief0000tkch_j0b9

31 D 13 Scrib 4467

TO THE READER

THE genesis of this book may be interesting. Early in the seventies I was impelled by zeal for progress to prepare the first draft of a somewhat full commentary on Genesis for the use of critically-minded students. The reason why the completion of this work was postponed was my realisation of the large part which Assyriological researches were destined to play in the renaissance of Biblical studies. 'With fresh archæological and Assyriological evidence I hoped to return some day to a problem which as yet "baffled" me' (*Origin of the Psalter*, 1891, Introduction, p. xvii.). But the study was not given up, and contributions were made from time to time to the questions arising out of Genesis, *e.g.* (in 1877) to a very important one, 'Can the Yahwistic narrative [in the early chapters of Genesis] be safely broken up into several'? None of these questions, however, could as yet be adequately answered, and it was the planning (by different scholars) of the *International Critical Commentary* and the *Encyclopædia Biblica* which stimulated me to further study. The word 'international' (familiar to readers of the original *Academy*) in connexion with scholarship expresses not only the ideal of these two works (and of Dr. Appleton's *Academy*), but the spirit in which I resumed the definite plan of a critical commentary. For the editors of the *International Commentary* were good enough to entrust me with the preparation of the volume on Genesis in their series.

No scholar, however, can be tied even to his own spoken or written words. As time goes on, he must make progress, and not merely by inches. It became at length clear to me that the editors would have to show me some measure of

Lake Erie College.
12724

indulgence. I wrote, therefore, to one of them, stating that while the current critical views on Genesis would in my proposed work have the lion's share of representation, yet I could not keep out references to new solutions of problems affected by my own new conclusions as to the Hebrew text and its meaning. I added that I hoped two volumes would not be deemed too much for such an important book as Genesis. I was informed, however, by Dr. Driver in a courteous letter that the American editor (Dr. Briggs) and publishers considered two volumes too much, and that they wished me (since I had offered to retire, if this seemed best) to produce what I had to say on Genesis in an 'independent work.' Certainly my own plan (of giving the lion's share of representation to views which I did not myself hold) appeared to me extremely generous, and the limitation of the International Commentary on Genesis to one volume seemed highly injurious to the interests of study. But the responsibility for the acceptance of my offer does not rest with my friend and colleague Dr. Driver.

Anything like a recast, with supplementary additions, of my former unpublished work seems to me to have become unnecessary. Dr. Skinner, who has written so well on Isaiah, will, I hope, do all that his narrow limits allow for Genesis. But there is much, very much, to be done, which I at least cannot, as a friend of progress, omit. In spite of a sore trouble, which visited me as the present work approached completion, I have finished and have now printed the best upon Genesis and Exodus known to me. I trust that something may have been gained both for textual criticism and for the better comprehension of the early traditions and beliefs of the Israelites. It is no mere commentary which is now presented to the friends of critical progress.

OXFORD, *April* 23, 1907.

[The manuscript of this work, apart from the Index, was sent to the publishers in November 1906.]

INTRODUCTION

THE persistent energy and resourceful ingenuity lavished by so many modern critics on the Hexateuch has by no means been unrewarded, but experienced scholars will admit that many of the results are far from final, and that numerous textual and historical difficulties await a more satisfactory explanation. There is therefore ample room for a fresh study of the early Hebrew traditions from a point of view which may perhaps do more justice alike to form and to contents. The problems of various kinds now before us are partly new, partly old questions which have lately become more complicated and difficult. The co-operation of critical scholars is therefore very much to be desired, as well as a more general recognition of the necessity of pioneering work. Unfortunately there is a tendency among members of the older school to misunderstand critical pioneers, and when they see new methods applied they are too often offended. Hence a deadlock threatens us, which I would fain contribute to avert. And as a preliminary to this it is right to mention a piece of doubtless unconscious unfairness which often meets my eye. It seems to be the fashion among some scholars to represent Winckler and Hommel as the only pioneers, the only original workers, in a certain field of study.[1] It is time that a protest should be raised against books and articles which convey such a wrong impression to readers. To offer an opinion on the 'North Arabian theory' without having carefully studied

[1] In refutation of this misrepresentation, see *Hibbert Journal*, July 1903, p. 755, note 1; Cheyne, *Book of Psalms* (1904), introd. p. xiv note 1; *Crit. Bib.* (1903-1904).

the points of view, the facts, and the results of all the investigators, is neither just in itself, nor conducive to the attainment of the great object which we have at heart.

As things now are, it is, I fear, only the field of early religious beliefs, of mythology and archæology, in which some amount of friendly co-operation among critics of all schools is possible, and even here the undue predominance of literary criticism hinders one from feeling that confidence which would otherwise be natural. Besides this, the comparative backwardness of textual criticism is unpropitious to common study. The value of critical theories as to the contents of an old Hebrew book depends on the soundness of their textual basis, and I wonder how many scholars have a clear conception of the textual work that lies before them! Of too many of our guild it may be truly said that they 'do not probe the wounds of the text half deeply enough, and lack that wide acquaintance with the textual phenomena, with the habits of the scribes and editors, and with recurring types of corruption, which has to be superadded to the rules applied by earlier scholars.'[1] I do not myself know where to point for as great a monument of text-critical ability in 1906 as that which Wellhausen gave us in his *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* in 1871. But ought we in 1906 to be no further advanced than we were in 1871?

This neglect and this deficiency are avenged by the tardy progress of the historical investigation of the O.T. Our critics are too much afraid of innovations. This is true even of Eduard Meyer, whose recent work, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* (1906), in spite of its provocative character, it would ill become me to pass over.[2] The general moderation of the book will doubtless commend it to not a few English scholars. And yet how peculiar that moderation is! It does not prevent the author from rejecting with insistent dogmatism the fundamental elements of the N. Arabian theory, in spite of the strong critical evidence derived from the O.T.; and it allows him to repeat

[1] *Crit. Bib.* prologue, pp. 3, 4.

[2] See 'Survey of Literature on the History of Israel,' *Review of Philosophy and Theology*, edited by Prof. Menzies, January 1907.

what he said seventeen years ago, that Nimrod is a very common Libyan name, and that this Libyan name was brought by Egyptians to Palestine, and placed in a new connexion ;[1] also that 'Shur' means 'the frontier rampart of Egypt,' and that 'Môsheh' (Moses), the greatest of Israel's heroes, derived his name from the language of the oppressors, a theory than which none can be more violently improbable.[2] As a textual critic, Meyer is of the same school as Stade. It grieves me much that neither of these scholars should have as yet cut himself free from the mechanical and superficial criticism which was perhaps unavoidable in the last century. This is how, in 1906, Meyer comments (p. 489, note 5) on the strange statement of the traditional text of Judg. iii. 31 : 'According to this passage Shamgar smote the Philistines (!)[3] with an ox-goad. So confined was the imagination of these miserable scribes (*Scribenten*).' Of the names Shamgar, Anath, Ya'el, he can only say (p. 489) that, while he will not guarantee their genuineness, he does not see who could have invented the two latter names. And on Winckler's proposal to explain the corrupt word שרשם (MT., 'their root') in Judg. v. 14 by the Assyrian verb *shâru* 'senken, niederlassen,' he remarks (p. 492) that, though 'ingenious,' it is 'still problematical.' No suggestion occurs to him as a textual critic.

Meyer, then, can be a very disappointing critic of the O.T., though, with his stores of varied learning, he cannot help making sometimes direct or indirect contributions to study from one or another point of view. I meet him with the same frankness with which he has met me, and must express the conviction that without a broader conception of method he will not do his best work in the O.T. In

[1] *Die Israeliten*, pp. 448 *f.*; cp. *ZATW* viii. 47, and *Gesch. des alten Aegyptens* (1887).

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Moses,' § 2, and below on Ex. ii. 10. I know that Meyer regards the genealogies in Chronicles as 'werthloses Zeug.' Still I will point out here that in 1 Chr. xxiii. both Môsheh and Mûshî occur among names which are demonstrably N. Arabian. The Chronicler knew things which came down from antiquity, though he could not see their bearing.

[3] The note of admiration is Meyer's.

criticising him thus, I criticise my former self; I take up no arrogant attitude towards the many-sided author of the *Geschichte des Alterthums.*

From Hugo Winckler, whose brilliant pioneering works I have often commended to advanced students,[1] I am partly separated, not only by my own deeper interest in religious ideas, but also by my long-reached conviction of the necessity of an improved textual criticism. As a textual critic, Winckler is no doubt on the whole bolder than Meyer, but he is deficient in method, and singularly inconsistent. Sometimes one is struck with surprise at his fertility in conjecture, and yet, on turning the page, one finds him unsuspiciously conservative where there is a loud call for methodical correction. The reason may perhaps be that he has not realised the extent of the danger to which all the Hebrew texts, narrative as well as poetical or prophetic, were for centuries exposed. I am not surprised that Baentsch has recently become a decided follower of Winckler.[2] Not being himself an advanced textual critic, there was little but educational prejudice to hinder him from doing so, and any educational prejudices his fearless love of truth has overcome.

It has been my unpleasant duty to lay repeated stress on the imperfections of our textual criticism. Scholars have hardly yet assimilated the idea that the letters of the traditional text are no more infallible than the points, and that the latest Jewish editors used a large amount of conjectural emendation. Those editors, however, were as conscientious as they were uncritical, and so, very often, they have left indications of an older underlying text. 'In my own judgment the only way to escape from a deadlock is to study the recurrent types of corruption in the received Hebrew text, and in that presupposed by the LXX., and the habits of the ancient editors in their manipulation of corrupt words, and so to be guided quite simply and naturally to new methods; and (2) to allow ourselves to receive suggestions in the application of our new methods from the

[1] See especially 'Babylon and the Bible,' *Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1903; *Bible Problems*, pp. 143-145, 255-260.

[2] *Altorientalischer und Israelitischer Monotheismus* (1906).

theory that the peoples by which the Israelites as known to us [from the literature] were most directly influenced were [together with the Canaanites] those of the N. Arabian borderland.'[1]

According to Ed. Meyer (p. 455) the theory of a confusion between Miṣrim (the N. Arabian Muṣri) and Miṣraim (Egypt) 'has met with very much acceptance, and in many works, *e.g.* the *E. Bib.*, and in Gunkel's commentary on Genesis, is treated as completely proved and ascertained fact.' This is unfortunately far from correct, and is most unfair to Gunkel, whom such an incorrect statement may possibly provoke to take up an uncongenial attitude. Ed. Meyer himself at any rate is provoked at an attack upon the new critical orthodoxy. The line that he has taken has been to deny the existence of O.T. evidence for the new theory, and to reject the theory itself mainly on the ground of geographical difficulties. Now, it so happens that I have done more for the O.T. side of the question than either Winckler or Hommel, and yet this scholar has not vouchsafed a single line to my investigations. Of his careless treatment of Winckler's evidence I might also speak severely. It would seem that he has begun the study of the question at the wrong end, and that (so far as my own works are concerned) he has not taken account of my express self-limitation. Provisional geographical conjectures I have not indeed avoided, but my main object has been to contribute as largely as possible to the correction of the text. And to avoid that subjectivity which is a critic's besetting danger, I have sought to control my theories by taking hints from the N. Arabian theory in a simple form. My geographical remarks have been designedly vague and undogmatic. I have waited for the help of those who may be willing and able to comprehend a new and unfamiliar point of view, and for future discoveries. Such hostile and superficial criticisms as those of the orthodox scholar Noordtzij[2] in the *Theologisch Tijd-*

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, July 1903, pp. 754 *f.*

[2] Note his remark on p. 400, 'Whatever the explanation of מלך ירב may be, at any rate we have here (Hos. v. 12) to do with Assyria.' But אשור is the name both of a larger and of a smaller N. Arabian

schrift (July and Sept. 1906) can be of little or no value either to Winckler, or to Hommel, or to myself.

I may here perhaps state my own conclusion that a large number of O.T. passages have no satisfactory meaning in their contexts, unless we admit that they refer to Miṣrim, Kûsh, Ashḥûr (Asshur), and Arâm or Yeraḥme'el. It also appears to me undeniable that these references have been discovered by a methodical textual criticism. I need hardly repeat here the list of passages given in *Bible Problems* (pp. 166-183, 262-270). No doubt what is there said could now be advantageously expanded or corrected, but, at any rate, neither Meyer nor Noordtzij has contributed anything to its amendment.

To economise space, therefore, I will call attention to some other passages which are certainly obscure and doubtful, and are most easily explained on the N. Arabian theory. It would not be difficult to add to their number, but with the list already referred to these may perhaps suffice. (*a*) Gen. xx. 11. רק אין־יראת אלהים. The difficulty here is in רק, which is by no means natural, and most probably comes from ירחם = רקם (Yarḥam = Yeraḥme'el). (*b*) Gen. xxv. 6. ארץ קדם. That קדם here (and in בני קדם) means neither 'the east' nor 'the south'[1] should be clear. It is hardly doubtful that קדם is = רקם. (*c*) Ex. x. 21. וימש חשך has probably come from הוא ישמ' אשחר, 'that is, Ishmael-Ashḥur,' a gloss on ארץ מצרים, 'the land of Miṣrim.' Geographical glosses like this occur frequently. The sense commonly given is most improbable. (*d*) Judg. iii. 31 (v. 6). שמגר בן־ענת. 'Shamgar' and 'Anath'[2] should be 'Gershom' (see on Ex. ii. 22) and 'Ethan' respectively. (*e*) Judg. iv. 2. סיסרא and חרשת have come from אשור and אשחרת respectively; יבין = ימין = ימן = ירחמאל. Is there any better explanation? (*f*) Judg. xv. 8. לחי = ירחל = ירחמאל. Similarly, in the much-tormented name transmitted as Beer-lahai-roi (Gen. xvi. 14). (*g*) The צרועה and אלמנה of 1 K. xi. 26 come respectively from מצריה,

district, and ירב (see *E. Bib.*, 'Jareb'; *Crit. Bib.* p. 123) is a corruption of עֲרָב.

[1] Winckler, *AOF* xxi. 312, 404, 420.

[2] Despaired of by Ed. Meyer (see *Die Isr.* p. 489).

'a Miṣrite,' and ירחמאלית, 'a Yeraḥme'elite.' See *Crit. Bib.*, p. 338. The discovery throws a fresh light on Jeroboam. (*h*) Ps. iii. 8. There seem to be three readings, לחי, לחים, and חנם, all pointing to ירחמאל. (*i*) Ps. ix. 21 *a*. שיתה יהוה מורה להם. 𝔊 reads the third word מוֹרָה. Duhm and Briggs are content with מורא, 'fear.' But surely the whole line is most unsatisfactory. Read תשחית יהוה ירחמאל. (*k*) Ps. x. 8, 10, 14. It has not been observed that ירחמאל underlies both חלכה and חלכאים. How else can we explain? (*l*) Ps. xxiv. 4. The historical colouring is lost. For למרמה read לירחמאל (cp. the proper names מרמה and מרמות). The cultus of Yeraḥme'el, as practised in N. Arabia, was repugnant to the prophets and psalmists. (*m*) Ps. xliv. 12. כצאן מאכל Impossible! Read צאנך לירחמאל, 'thy flock to Yeraḥme'el' (the people, not the god). (*n*) Ps. lxxxi. 17 *b*. The key is furnished by ומצור. Read מִמְּצוֹר וּצְפַת אֹשִׁיעֶם (*Psalms*, 1904, ii. 38). (*o*) Ps. lxxxiii. 9. 'The mention of Asshur is difficult to explain' (Bäthgen, 3rd ed.), unless, indeed, there be a N. Arabian Asshur! See on Gen. ii. 14, x. 22, xxv. 18.

Most of these passages attest 'Yeraḥme'el' as a prevalent N. Arabian ethnic name; three refer to the Arabian Muṣri. 'Ishmael' is a synonym of Yeraḥme'el; 'Asshur' of 'Ashḥur' and 'Ashtar.' That 'Aram' is = 'Yeraḥme'el' will be amply proved in the course of our studies. See *e.g.* on Gen. xvii. 3: אברם attests Ram (= 'Aram'); אברהם, Raham = Raḥam = Yarḥam (see above on *a*). Need I say that the southern tribes, from which the Israelites proceeded, were of different degrees of culture? The Amalekites represent the less-advanced section of the great Yeraḥme'elite race; but there was another section far more cultivated, as indeed we might expect, and as Winckler has to all intents and purposes proved.[1]

I shall have to return to this later. At present, it may be enough to say that the Yeraḥme'elites were not a mere petty under-tribe, but a truly great race, which carried its beliefs and sacred usages, its names and its conventional

[1] See Winckler, *Arabisch-semitisch-orientalisch*, and cp. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, pp. 303 *f.*, who is by comparison vague.

phrases, far away to southern Syria, and its names even to Babylonia. To it the Israelites also are demonstrably much indebted; their early traditions, which we shall presently study in Genesis and Exodus, are largely due to the Yeraḥme'elites. Indeed, the very names of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as well as of the sons of Jacob, and of Moses and his family, forcibly suggest this view.

I should, of course, not venture to say this if I had not given considerable attention to the study of Hebrew names. I will not repeat what I have said elsewhere (see pp. 32, 43) on the names carried northward by Yeraḥme'elites in their migrations, but will ask attention to my treatment of apparently totemistic names, such as Ḥamor at Shechem (Gen. xxxiii. 19, xxxiv. 2), and those of the Ḥorites (Ashḥurites?) in Gen. xxxvi.[1] I hold that it is a mistake to account for the real or apparent animal names in these passages on the theory that the tribes named themselves after those animals which they regarded as of kin to them, as the seats of the spirits of their ancestors, and hence as gods. That the original gods most probably developed out of supposed supernatural animals, I willingly admit, but I do not think that the names referred to can be quoted in connexion either with such a theory or with that once made so plausible by the late W. Robertson Smith.[2] But while agreeing very much with Ed. Meyer in opposition to the friend who has gone to a higher school, I cannot think with him that most of the apparent animal names of clans (such as lion, hyena, antelope) are honorific, indicating that the clans either wished or claimed to possess the leading qualities of the particular animals, while others (such as boar, flea) were originally given in derision on account of some physical or moral defect, but in course of time came to be used without any consciousness of their origin. The truth seems to be that the names Shobal, Ṣibeʿon, Dishon, interpreted as 'lion,' 'hyena,' 'antelope,' and not less the names Ḥezir, Parʿosh, explained as 'boar,' 'flea,' have quite another

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Shaphan.'

[2] 'Animal Worship,' etc., *Journ. of Philology*, ix. 75 *ff.*; cp. *Kinship*[2], pp. 253 *ff.*, with references in footnote.

origin from that ascribed to them by Robertson Smith or Ed. Meyer. For the former, I may refer to the notes on Gen. xxxvi. 20 *f.*; for the latter, I may say here that while Ḥezir is of somewhat obscure origin, Parʿosh appears to be certainly from עֲרַב־אֹשֶׁר (cp. on פרא, Gen. xvi. 12).[1] It is surely something to be able to answer Meyer's question, 'How comes the principal *gens* of Judah by this designation?' a question by which both Meyer and Wellhausen, as the former confesses,[2] have been baffled. Ḥezir is, at any rate, not 'boar,' as we see from the company in which this name, as well as Parʿosh, is placed in Neh. x. 14 *ff.* Possibly enough, like Zeraḥ, it comes from Ashḥur. Those who are accustomed to pursue analogies and parallels will not, I believe, be shocked at this.

It will now also be plain what answer should be given to Dr. Buchanan Gray's question, 'Do such words as אחיה, אביה, and, if compound, יואב, indicate a transition from the totem conception of kindred with a divine or totem animal to a conception of kinship with a personal God? . . . Whether this be so or not, must depend on the extent to which the totem theory can be independently established; but, if it be so, it gives a satisfactory explanation of otherwise difficult names. Etymologically, names like אביה are comparatively straightforward; theologically, they are most difficult, and that whether we interpret them Father is Yah, or My father is Yah, or Father of Yah.'[3] The answer is that the Hebrew names give no support to the theory of early Israelitish totemism, and can only to a very moderate extent be used as evidence for the inwardness of Israelitish piety. A very large proportion of the O.T. names had originally a geographical meaning. At an early date, however, a number of them were modified so as to assume a religious significance, but I am afraid that names like Abijah, Ahijah, Hamutal, etc., will not bear the meanings

[1] Cp. Lucian's φαδασσουρ for MT.'s Pashḥur, Ezra ii. 38. Pashḥur, which W. M. Müller interprets 'portion of Horus,' is probably from Parashḥur, *i.e.* Arab-ashḥur, and is equivalent, as to its etymology, with Parʿosh. Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Flea,' 'Parosh,' 'Pashhur.'

[2] Meyer, *Jul. Wellhausen und meine Schrift*, etc., 1897, p. 21 (it is Meyer's reply to Wellh.).

[3] Gray, *Hebrew Proper Names*, pp. 253 *f.*

which I myself formerly, like Dr. Buchanan Gray, put upon them. This, however, will be referred to more at length in the course of our investigations.

How far the outlines of early tribal movements can be traced underneath the legends of Genesis and Exodus is another point of equal difficulty and importance. Before we can treat it satisfactorily, we must approach very much nearer than we have hitherto done to the underlying Hebrew text. It is, at any rate, somewhat easier to detect the mythological elements, and here I hope that I may have given some help to scholars such as Winckler, Gunkel, and Ed. Meyer. I am, of course, aware that the Hebrew narrators and editors have done their best to weaken the mythological colouring. But here again their conscientiousness has preserved material enough for some probable conjectures. Underneath the *rûaḥ elôhîm* of Gen. i. 2 *b* it is not difficult to discover the original divine agent, and even in the uncorrected Hebrew text a conscientious scholar like Ed. Meyer can see (as I too, after Winckler, have seen) elements of the Adonis-Tamûz myth in the Joseph-story. Probably my chief difference from some of the searchers after mythical elements may be that I have not thought myself bound by method to confine my comparison of myths to those which lie nearest at hand. Polynesian myths, for instance, still (as in 1877) seem to me specially remunerative, and to these I should now add the N. American. I will not, however, anticipate.

With regard to my views on the history of Israelitish religion, I am prepared for some reluctance on the part of many scholars to accept them. It is, however, historically very plausible that the Arabians, with whom early Israel was connected, had as their objects of worship a divine duad (or triad), and 'if the Kenites associated an Ashtart with Yahweh, Moses and the Hebrews would inevitably worship her too';[1] *i.e.* the duad (or triad) must once have included a goddess. I think that I have added much to the textual basis for such a theory; witness, *e.g.*, the new explanation of the compound divine name Yahweh-Ṣebāʿōth. I have shown, too, that the Arabian

[1] Barton, *Semitic Origins* (1902), p. 290.

deity who preceded Yahweh is frequently mentioned in the O.T., and that the Israelites frequently combined the name Yahweh, not only with that of the goddess referred to, but also with that of the great Arabian god; witness the phrase, now at length restored, Yerahme'el-Yahweh. I have not, however, been able to show who were those individuals of more than average capacities who may have taken the lead in the religious movements referred to. To assert that they were called Abraham and Moses, I have never felt at liberty to admit. I can no more follow Winckler's apparently scientific attempt to prove Abraham to be a religious missionary from the references to Ur and Ḥarran[1] than that of Hommel, who thinks that the traditions of the Mosaic period are supported by the Arabian personal names of the Babylonian dynasty of Ḫammurabi.[2] As to Moses, I can sympathise with Giesebrecht's protest against a meagre evolutionary view of Israel's religion. But I cannot see what right we have to extract morsels of history from the legendary and late narratives of the legislator Moses.[3] That there was a Mosheh-clan is highly probable, but the occasional efforts of narrators to endow a vague representative of that clan with concrete features (Ex. ii. 11-iv. 23, xvii. 3 *f.*; Num. xx. 7-11) cannot be said to be satisfactory as historical evidence.

One may venture to hope that able though somewhat prejudiced critics like Giesebrecht will before long see this. It is, at any rate, neither true religion nor sound criticism which opposes the full and free discussion of the traditional story of the Exodus. Nor can I see that the shock to educational prejudice is mitigated by supposing that Miṣraim had a wide range of meaning, and included some part of N. Arabia, which was claimed by Egypt. The theory does not seem to me to work easily; I therefore pass it over as an unsatisfactory makeshift. It may seem strange, but it is most probably true, that S. Syria and Palestine were enclosed between two lands, both independent of Egypt, called Muṣri. From the southern Muṣri, according to the original

[1] *Abraham als Babylonier, Joseph als Aegypter* (1903).
[2] *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition* (1897).
[3] *Die Israeliten*, p. 451, note 1.

tradition,[1] came the Israelitish Exodus, or, perhaps one may venture to call it, migration; such, at least, is the view anticipated, so far as was possible, in 1834 by our countryman, Dr. C. T. Beke, which appears to me the most probable. Perhaps I may, with all modesty, mention the half-way house in which I rested for a time, viz. that there were Israelitish tribes in the N. Arabian Muṣur who were never in the Muṣur of Egypt,[2] and that those who were in the Egyptian Muṣur effected a junction with those who were in the Muṣur of N. Arabia. This, however, appears to me now too hazardous. The scene of the Joseph-story was not originally in Egypt but in N. Arabia, in spite of the fresh plausibility conferred upon the old theory by Marquart.[3]

From a textual point of view, it seems to me difficult to deny that the Exodus of which the original tradition spoke was from a region in N. Arabia. It is a great mistake to suppose that the O.T. in general favours the alternative theory of the Exodus from Egypt. Let us consider this matter awhile textually. (1) I have pointed out a number of geographical glosses in Genesis and Exodus which point distinctly to the new theory. (2) It is true that the Joseph-story and the Exodus-story do in some places present a markedly Egyptian colouring. But this may without violence be ascribed to the activity of a redactor. The four or five Egyptian words, not proper names, which have been thought to exist in the Joseph-narratives (see Driver, *Genesis*, Introd. p. li, note 1) are, even on Driver's showing, some of them doubtful. What I hold them to be myself I have sufficiently pointed out; we have to look behind the traditional text. 'He that seeketh (in the right way) findeth.' (3) Next, as to 1 K. xii. 28. The land of מצרים there spoken of may just as well have been the N. Arabian Muṣri as Egypt. (4) Am. ix. 7 is, to say the least, equally vague, but if the other names are Arabian (which may plausibly be argued), so also, presumably, is מצרים. (4) and (5) In Am. ii. 10, iv. 25, we should most probably read 'in the wilderness

[1] Winckler himself does not regard the tradition of the Exodus as historical.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, col. 1434.

[3] See *E. Bib.*, 'Joseph.'

of the Arabians' (ערבים; see on xv. 13, xxiii. 2), and in Mic. vi. 4, 'out of the house (= land) of the Arabians.' The other passages relative to the Exodus and the accompanying events —all of which are post-exilic—may, for the most part, conceivably refer to Egypt. They are—Isa. x. 26, xi. 15 *f.*, xliii. 16 *f.*, li. 10, lxiii. 11-13; Ps. lxvi. 6, lxxviii. 12, 43-53, cv. 23-42, cvi. 7-23, cxiv. 1-8, cxxxvi. 10-16; Neh. ix. 9, 11. Some of these, however, cannot, in my opinion, refer to Egypt; *e.g.* in Pss. lxxviii., cv., cvi., I hold it to be certain that Ḥam, which is parallel to Miṣrim,[1] is a shortened form of Yarḥam (= Yeraḥme'el). See on Gen. ix. 18.

This may, I hope, be enough to show that the theory of the N. Arabian sojourn and exodus of Israel is by no means devoid of probability. Into the details of this sojourn and exodus I need not now enter. Before we discuss the amount of the historical element possibly present in the traditions, we have to obtain a somewhat more original text. If, to any one, the results obtained in this work are disappointingly negative, I may venture to remind him that 'God is not banished from the history of Israel even if the Exodus was attended by no physical signs and wonders, no slaughter of the Egyptian first-born, no drowning of a hostile king in the Red Sea.'[2] I trust, however, that negation has here gone hand in hand with affirmation, and that our new examination of Genesis and Exodus may reveal to us more than a few facts which may serve as useful material for the reconstruction of the history of Israel's religion.

The division of the following pages into four parts, relating respectively to the first, the second, the third, and the fourth age of the world, will be explained in full when we come to the investigation of a turning-point in P's version of the traditions—Gen. xvii. The Priestly Writer, at any rate, seems to have grasped with some firmness the theory of the four ages of the world, a theory which is characteristic-

[1] See Cheyne, *Book of Psalms* (1904), on the psalm-passages referred to. 'Ṣoan,' too, points in the same direction. It most probably comes from Ṣib'on, one of the forms of Ishmael (see on Gen. xxxvi. 20).

[2] *E. Bib.*, 'Plagues (the Ten),' § 5.

ally old Oriental,[1] and may therefore suggest a convenient arrangement of our survey of the traditions and beliefs of ancient Israel. I may be allowed in conclusion to recommend the constant use of the Index, without which the full range of this work can hardly be estimated.

[1] Babylon probably, and Persia certainly, knew of four world-ages. Cp. *Enc. Brit.*[10], 'Cosmogony,' § 2.

NOTE.—The abbreviations used in the present work are for the most part those adopted in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. The rest will, I hope, quickly explain themselves to critical readers.

ADDENDA

Pp. 23, 146. Ashtar, as the name of a god and a locality. Compare the Phœnician name ארשתבעל (Euting), commonly explained 'the espoused of Baal,' but really miswritten for אשתרבעל. Also עבראש (Cooke, p. 129), not 'servant of Ares,' but from עֶבֶד אשתר.

Pp. 34 *f.* On the ark cp. Hommel, 'The Ark of Jahveh,' *Exp. Times*, Jan. 1907, who compares the ark with the *parak šimâti*, *i.e.* the shrine which contained the tablets of destiny (New Year's Festival).

P. 54. Sammael, according to Bousset (*Rel. des Jud.*[2] p. 291, note 2), was 'originally a Syrian god Šemâl.' But what, pray, is the origin of Šemâl? Surely some form of Išmael.

P. 157 *f.* Bousset (*op. cit.* pp. 251-253) remains under the delusion that צפון in Ezek. xxxviii. 6 and parallels means 'the north.' He sees the connexion of the 'king of the north' (Dan. xi. 40-45) with the prophecy of Gog, but gets no further. See my review of Cornill's *Introduction to the O.T.* in *The Nation*, 27th April 1907.

P. 166. G. Hüsing too is sceptical as to a Tarshish in S. Spain. The true situation, he thinks, is 'doubtless in the direction of Opir, *i.e.* Elam, which is reached from Ezion-geber.' In Gen. and 1 Chr. we should read, not 'Tarshish,' but 'Turshim.' *OLZ*, Jan. 1907, cols. 26 *b*, 27 *a*.

TRADITIONS OF THE FIRST AGE OF THE WORLD, BEGINNING WITH THE COSMOGONY (GEN. I.-II. 4*a*)

THERE was a time when it was said that the Hebrew cosmogony was clearly based upon the Iranian. The view was not unplausible, assuming it to have been proved that the historico-legislative work known to students as the Priestly Code was of the 'post-exilic' age. And when we study the Zoroastrian Scriptures, especially the Gâthas, we are struck by the parallelism between the Yahweh of the most advanced Hebrew writers and the Ahura Mazda of the Zoroastrians. Take the Avesta as a whole, and the spirituality of the most high God—His activity, intelligence, and holiness—comes out very plainly. Nor is the famous dualism of the Vendîdâd any great objection. When dualism has found its perfect expression, we find it to be neither better nor worse than the dualism of the Apocalypse of John, which is a sound development from earlier Judaism, and to be quite reconcilable with the supremacy of the one true God. In the Gâthas, however—the communings of the prophet Zarathustra with his God in a metrical form,—dualism is not so prominent as in the Vendîdâd, while polytheism, of which the rest of the Avesta contains so much, is almost or quite absent. We are bound to form a very high estimate of the theism of the Gâthas, and it is an honour both to the worship of Yahweh and to that of Ahura Mazda to compare them.

At the same time, we have no right to assume that the Jewish circles from which the Priestly Code proceeded were acquainted with the Zoroastrian beliefs in any literary form. All that we can safely say is that 'Zoroastrian ideas were in

the air in the Persian period of Jewish history, and must have circulated freely throughout the empire.'[1] More especially those Jews who resided in Babylonia must have been open to a breath from the advanced theism of Persia. There is little probability, however, in Lagarde's view (see his *Purim*, 1887) that the Zoroastrian cosmogony influenced the Jewish.[2] In the former the works of the Creator are six in number; in the latter, eight, if not ten. In the former, pre-existent matter is dispensed with; in the latter it is presupposed. In the former, Angra Mainyu (the evil principle personified) is for a time comparatively successful, not being finally destroyed till the end of the world; in the latter there is no attempt at opposition to the Creator's will. If the Jewish writers had the slightest degree of acquaintance with the Zoroastrian cosmogony, it was most probably only by report. And we may be sure that they were much more interested in reports of Babylonian myths, which might serve to revive the fading colours of older Israelitish myths, long since largely indebted, directly or indirectly, to the mythic traditions of Babylonia.

But can we venture to endorse the statement of some popular writers that the cosmogony in Gen. i. is borrowed from Babylonia? Certainly not. It must have required the labour of successive generations to bring the Babylonian myth into the form in which the Priestly Writer and a later redactor have transmitted their cosmogony to us. Nor is it at all certain that we still possess the exact form of the Babylonian myth, on the basis of which the early Israelitish myth was most likely recast. What may be reasonably stated is that it must in many points have resembled the story in the Babylonian creation-epic. As for the older Israelitish creation-story, it may have been derived either from the Canaanites or from that N. Arabian people among whom the Israelites probably sojourned. For obviously many myths may have existed in Canaan and N. and E. Arabia which have now hopelessly vanished. 'These myths doubtless had peculiarities of their own. From one of them

[1] See Cheyne, 'The Book of Psalms, its Origin, and its Relation to Zoroastrianism,' *Semitic Studies in Memory of A. Kohut* (1897), pp. 111-119.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Creation,' § 9.

may have come that remarkable statement in Gen. i. 2 *b*, "and the spirit of God (Elohim) was hovering over the face of the waters," which, until we find some similar myth nearer home, is best illustrated and explained by a Polynesian myth (see below). It is also probably to a non-Babylonian source that we owe the prescription of vegetarian or herb diet in Gen. i. 29, 30, which has a Zoroastrian parallel (*Bundahish*, xv. 2) and is evidently based on a myth of the Golden Age, independent of the Babylonian cosmogony.'[1]

Of the relation between the Israelitish story, whether in its older or in its more recent form, and Egyptian myths not much need here be said. In very early and probably pre-Israelitish times Egypt may have had considerable religious influence on the land of Canaan or Palestine, and it would be easy to indicate points of affinity between the Egyptian cosmogony and that in Gen. i. The conception of the primeval watery envelope of all things, also that of creation by a word, also the story of the conflict between Re' or Ra the Sun-god and the gigantic dragon Apepi or Apopi, remind us forcibly of the Babylonian and in a wide sense of the Hebrew cosmogony. But while fully admitting the combination of influences to which the Israelites were exposed, I do not think that the influence of Egypt upon the Israelites can be reckoned as at all comparable to that of Babylonia.[2]

Let us now look more closely at the cosmogony compiled and adapted by the Priestly Writer (P). One of the first things that strike us is the non-mention of the contest between the Creator and the Dragon, which is so prominent in the chief Babylonian story. P (or his predecessor) must have been well aware of the leading incidents in such a widely spread myth; why did he ignore this special point?[3] Probably he thought it unseemly to recog-

[1] *Enc. Brit.*[10], 'Cosmogony.'

[2] Besides the usual books on Egyptian religion (Brugsch, Wiedemann, etc.), see A. Grenfell, 'Egyptian Mythology and the Bible,' *The Monist* (1906), pp. 169-200; G. St. Clair, *Creation Records* (1898).

[3] Contrast the author of Ps. viii., at least if Duhm and Cheyne, in their commentaries, may be followed.

nise such a being as Tiâmat, as having power to hinder progress by contending with the God of light and order. Certainly, too, he wished to mention the hovering or brooding of *rūăh ĕlōhīm* over the waters, a detail inconsistent with the dragon-story. Had he mentioned the monster at all, he would probably have called it by some appellation like *tannīn*, 'serpent' (Isa. li. 10). We cannot, however, feel sure that he would have represented the dragon as slain, for there are passages in the O.T. and elsewhere (see below) in which the monster is only imprisoned. This mode of representation made it possible to speak metaphorically of the dragon (or serpent) as working havoc in creation long after the primeval contest, though, truth to say, the writer of Isa. li. 10 *b* virtually makes the dead dragon come to life again in the person of an oppressive king, to harass Yahweh's people.

One cannot, however, help regretting the complete omission of the dragon. The primeval physical redemption from the dragon had a typical and prospective significance. This is recognised in Isa. lix. 9, and virtually in the Johannine Apocalypse. For the picture in Rev. xii. of the heavenly woman who bears the Messiah, and is persecuted by the dragon till Michael and his angels overcome the monster, is antitypical. This, however, would have been clearer if the fight with the dragon had found a place at the head of the O.T. One may also add that the picture in Rev. xii. might well have closed the O.T. writings, for it is evidently of Jewish origin, as indeed the whole book is Jewish-Christian. At the same time we may frankly admit that a large part of the Babylonian details respecting Tiâmat can well be spared, and among them the grotesque division of the dragon's carcase to produce heaven and earth.[1] This strange mythic detail is indeed hardly original. The true original matrix or envelope of the watery mass of primeval chaos was presumably the cosmic egg.[2] It is N. America and Polynesia, the classic lands of mythology, which most clearly show us this (see below), and indeed even one of the poor, pale, composite Phœnician traditions expressly states it.[3]

[1] Jastrow, *Rel. Bab. Ass.* p. 428.

[2] Tiâmat and the egg are connected by Robertson Smith (see *E. Bib.*, col. 493, top). [3] Damascius, *De Primis Principiis*, c. 125.

What, then, originally was the dragon, if not the watery mass of chaotic matter personified? He (for the male sex is attested as well as the female) was a mighty preternatural Being, incapable himself of progress, and hostile to all those who might attempt it. The dark ocean was his abode, and the *Bundahish* (the Parsee Genesis) appropriately says[1] that when the fiend saw the glory of the light of the Most High, 'he fled back to the gloomy darkness, and formed many demons and fiends,' able and eager to destroy. In short, like the *tannīnīm* ('serpents,' 'dragons') in Ps. lxxiv. 13, he was not the great water itself, but *upon* it. Indeed, the dragon is once called 'the dragon in the sea,' at least if the traditional text of Isa. xxvii. 1 may be trusted. We infer, then, that in the original myth a company of sea-monsters, with one at their head, were imagined to be on the great waters. They were the 'helpers of Rahab' (Job ix. 13), 'the enemies of Yahweh' (Ps. lxxxix. 11); a late but well-informed source even speaks of 'the dragon and his angels' (Rev. xii. 7). In the Babylonian myth they are the eleven monsters formed by Tiâmat, who with his consort Kingu represent the animal forms of the zodiac. Most probably, however, these monsters had a place in a myth of origins which had no reference to the zodiac or to astral deities, and we may compare the flood-myth (or second creation-myth) of the Algonkins in N. America, in which a prominent part is assigned to the water-serpents. These extraordinary animals, in fact, produce the flood.[2]

We have already seen that the fate of the dragon was variously related. There is a sufficient reason for this variety. Regarding him (or her) as a symbol of the watery envelope of the earth, he might fitly be said to have been destroyed when those waters dried up (cp. Isa. li. 10). The original myth, however, cannot have said that the waters enveloping the earth dried up. According to Ps. civ. 7 they fled away, scared by Yahweh's battle-cry, and in the paler language of Gen. i. they were 'gathered together into one

[1] *Bund.* i. 10 (*SBE* v. 6). The *Bundahish*, though in its present form not earlier than 651 A.D., contains very ancient traditions.

[2] Schoolcraft, *Myth of Hiawatha* (1856), pp. 35-39; and cp. *Journ. of Amer. Folklore*, iv. 210-213.

place' at the divine command. Mythologically they must have had in their midst a preternaturally gifted Being to control them. The proofs of this are not far to seek. It was a dragon who carved out the channel of the river Orontes, and a dragon who hid within the Nile and devoured its banks; and it is still, as the people believe, a dragon in St. Mary's well (near Jerusalem) during whose sleep the water gushes forth.[1] No wonder, then, that in the Johannine Apocalypse (Rev. xii. 3) the dragon of chaos reappears alive, and perhaps we may add that on Babylonian cylinders older than the time of Ḥammurabi the dragon is represented as harnessed to a chariot and driven by Bel.[2] That a dragon hostile to Yahweh exists, appears from Isa. xxvii. 1, where the destruction of 'Leviathan,' or the dragon, is a feature of the latter day. At present he is quiet, paralysed by the onset and battle-cry of Yahweh. He is 'in the depths of the ocean, over the fountains of the waters' (Enoch lx. 7; cp. Amos ix. 3), *i.e.* the subterranean ocean spoken of in the Prayer of Manasseh (*v.* 3) as 'sealed by God's terrible and glorious name.' Only specially gifted men can stir him up, such as can be found in Arabia—the home of magic,—for Job says, 'Let the magicians of Yaman[3] curse it, those who have skill to stir up Leviathan' (Job iii. 8). We must not, however, quote Job vii. 12 in proof of the continued existence of the dragon. 'Am I a sea or a dragon' does not make a good sense. We should probably read 'am I a wild-ox or a serpent,' two dangerous but not preternatural animals being put side by side. Nor Isa. xxx. 7 (Gunkel, 'the silenced Rahab'), where 'Rahab' is not a mythological term, but most probably a sarcastic modification of Raḥam, the short for Yarḥam or Yeraḥme'el.[4] It may be objected that 'Rahab' *is* elsewhere (Job ix. 13, xxvi. 12,

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Dragon,' § 4; Maspero, *Dawn of Civilisation*, p. 90.

[2] *E. Bib.*, 'Dragon,' § 7.

[3] Reading ימן for ים[ו]. A friend of Gunkel had already suggested יָם. ימן (written ים) may be short either for 'Yerahmeel' or for 'Ishmael.' So too in Isa. xxvii. 1, בים, 'in the sea,' should perhaps be בימן, 'in Yāmān,' and in Job ix. 8 we should read 'the high places of Yāmān.' See on x. 2 (Yavan).

[4] The reference in Isa. xxx. is to an embassy to Miṣrim (the N. Arabian Muṣri); see 'Isaiah,' *SBOT* (Hebrew edition).

Ps. lxxxix. 11, Isa. li. 9) a mythological name for the dragon of chaos. This, however, is an imperfect statement of the truth. 'Rahab' is only a name for the dragon because the dragon is identified by Hebrew writers with Israel's great foe, Miṣrim (not Miṣraim) or Yeraḥme'el, an equivalent for which is the much-tormented word Rahab.

And who was the Great One who could vanquish this preternatural but unprogressive Being? Or, in other words, who was the Creator? The text of the Hebrew cosmogony suggests that it was a Man, the type and model of the lordly men created on the sixth day (*vv.* 26-28). Like men he speaks; like men he works; like men he rests. He loves order and peace (*v.* 29 implies that the lower animals are not to be killed). He also, even when at work, loves society (cp. ii. 18)—'let *us* make man.' He takes pleasure in his creations (cp. Ps. civ. 31), more especially in his men ('God blessed them'—'everything was very good'). Still he preserves a certain distance; he does not seem to contemplate dwelling on the earth himself; if he has a Paradise, it must be in heaven.

So, then, he has a strong human personality. His name, functions, and attributes we shall consider later. At present let us be content with emphasising one great fact, viz. that he is no personification of nature or of any part of nature. He is indeed above nature, even more decidedly than man (unless he be a magician) is above the lower animals. But was he always so? Was there not a time when the ancestors of the Priestly Writer conceived of the highest Being as a mixture of man and animal? For not man alone was wonderfully endowed; the animals themselves had gifts which compelled both admiration and awe. A Babylonian legend said that the goddess Ishtar contracted brief unions with a lion, a horse, and a bird. So great was still the belief in the kinship between the gods and the animals. Surely, then, the greatest Being of those far-off people must have had an animal side, must at least have had the power of changing at will into a preternaturally gifted animal. If so, must there not, according to an early form of the Canaanitish or N. Arabian creation-myth, have been animals before the 'creation'? For this, the Algonkin

creation-story gives us a parallel. It tells us of the creator-hero (Michabo, the 'Great Hare') as being, with a number of animals, on a raft on the shoreless waters. After successive trials, he induces the musk-rat to dive for a morsel of earth. Of this, Michabo makes an island; perhaps there is here a notion of America.[1] Such a limited creation the early Canaanites too (or their predecessors) may conceivably have imagined.

We can now account for the reference in *v.* 2 *b* to a Being, evidently concerned in creation, and occupying no merely ministering station, who 'hovered (or brooded) over the face of the waters.' Must not this Being have had the form of a great and mighty (female) bird?[2] The fem. part. forbids us indeed to suppose that the Supreme Being himself was intended. But it is not superfluous to point out that in three passages Yahweh, as the Creator and Preserver of Israel, is compared to an eagle (strictly, vulture), and that in a fourth his chariot or vehicle is a mighty bird. The three passages are Ex. xix. 4, Dt. xxxii. 11, and Mal. iii. 20 (allusion to the winged sun-disk[3]); the fourth is Ps. xviii. 11, where the description favours a conception of the cherub as a bird,[4] and most plausibly as an eagle. But have we a right to group Ps. xviii. 11 with the three former passages? It seems to me that we have, and I would appeal to an eminent Vedic scholar (Oldenberg) in support of this. His view and my own is that when a particular animal is specially attached to a god, it points to an original incarnation of that god in the animal.[5] There is particularly strong evidence for this in the case of the god Indra (originally, it is maintained, an eagle-god), and it seems to me reasonable to suppose that Yahweh was com-

[1] See Chamberlain, *Journal of American Folklore*, iv. 208 *f.*, and cp. Brinton, *Myths of the New World*, pp. 176-179.

[2] See the present writer's article 'Cosmogony,' *Enc. Brit.*[(9)], 1876; cp. Gunkel, *Schöpfung* (1895), p. 8.

[3] Cp. Miss S. Y. Stevenson, *Papers of the Oriental Club* (Philadelphia, 1894), pp. 232 *ff.* The winged disk was the symbol of the god Ashur.

[4] It is true the conception of the form of the cherub varied. We see this from Ezekiel. But note that in Ezek. i. 10 one of the faces of the cherub is that of an eagle.

[5] Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda* (1894), pp. 74, 75.

pared to an eagle or vulture, because the god Yeraḥme'el, his predecessor,[1] was imagined to have sometimes taken the form of that bird. That the Arabians worshipped vultures, has been shown by Robertson Smith.[2] This implies appearances of gods in vulture-form. Some old hymn to the god Yarḥam or Yeraḥme'el may have referred to him as a vulture, and hence may have come the favourite O.T. figure of Yahweh's eagle or vulture wings. Clearly, too, the Creator's assistant might, from the primitive point of view, be equally well imagined as a great bird. In the *Kalevala*[3] it is a duck which lays six golden eggs and a seventh of iron on the knees of Ether's daughter Ilmatar, in the vast expanse of ocean. Ilmatar shakes her limbs, and the eggs are dashed to pieces, but the pieces come together again transformed. Other Finnish traditions, however, say that it was the eagle that laid the world-egg.[4] In Polynesia it is as an enormous bird who hovers over the waters, and there deposits an egg, that the heaven-god and creator Tangaloa is imagined,[5] while the Athapascans of North America say that it was 'a mighty bird (a raven), whose eyes were fire, whose glances were lightning, and the clapping of whose wings was thunder,' on whose descent to the ocean the earth instantly rose.[6]

It now becomes a question whether, instead of 'hovering,' the earlier myth must not rather have meant 'brooding' as the form of activity assigned to the Great Being spoken of. The rendering 'hovered' in *v.* 2 is no doubt supported by Dt. xxxii. 11 (see Driver's note), but 'brooded' is in accordance with the Syriac, and fits the presumed original reference to the cosmic egg. As von Bohlen remarks, to render 'brooded' in Gen. i. 2 is unfair to the compiler of Gen. i., who deliberately rejects the cosmic egg. But there can be no doubt as to the sense intended in the earlier myth. The

[1] To justify this, see below.

[2] *Kinship*[(2)], p. 244. Nasr, a vulture-god, was worshipped by the Himyarites (p. 243).

[3] Crawford's transl., Rune i.

[4] So Le Duc's *Kalevala.*

[5] Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vi. 236 *f.*

[6] Mackenzie, in Brinton's *Myths*, p. 211. On the place of birds in the N. American creation and flood myths, see Brinton, pp. 204, 220.

Bird-creator and the cosmic egg (a figure suggested by the earth with the over-arching vault of heaven) go together. Let us remark next that, as a consequence of the non-mention of the egg, the result of the activity of the 'hovering' or 'brooding' has also had to be omitted, for *v.* 3 clearly begins afresh. Nor does the Priestly Writer state how 'darkness' was produced; evidently, like chaos, it pre-existed. We are told, however, that Elohim named the darkness (light and darkness being material entities, cp. Job xxxviii. 19 *f.*), *i.e.* made it subservient to his purposes. Another writer, however, in the course of a protest against dualism, boldly makes Yahweh style himself the 'creator of darkness' (Isa. xlv. 7). Evidently he has a passion for God, and cannot leave any part of the universe unaccounted for on monotheistic principles.

Another question may be raised in this connexion. It is this, Where was the Supreme Being when he began to create the world? The mythologies say that both heaven and the gods were produced out of primeval darkness. In a Maori legend, for instance, we find darkness (called Po; cp. Ἔρεβος) personified as the begetter both of Light and of Nought.[1] In Babylonia, too, the light-gods necessarily arise out of dark chaos. The Priestly Writer of Israel, however, abstains reverently from any statement which might seem derogatory to Elohim. One thinks, however, that he might have said that 'before the hills' Elohim was, and that his dwelling-place was in those 'uncreated lights' which have neither end nor beginning. The Parsee Genesis may here supplement the Jewish. 'One is he who is independent of unlimited time, because Aûharmazd and the region, religion, and time of Aûharmazd were and are and ever will be.'[2] A Hebrew psalmist, however, also supplements Gen. i., when he says of Yahweh, 'Who wrappest thyself in light as in a mantle (Ps. civ. 2); this may reasonably be taken to imply all that the *Bundahish* says.[3]

[1] Shortland, in Waitz-Gerland, vi. 267.

[2] *Bundahish*, i. 3.

[3] See Cheyne, *Psalms*[(2)], *ad loc.* The Avesta (*Vendidad*, ii. 40) says, 'There are uncreated lights and created lights.' A Vedic hymn 'represents the creation as a ray entering the realm of darkness from

We now turn to the creative works.[1] The first is light. 'Elohim said, Let light be; and light was.' Did Elohim speak light into being? That, however, would be inconsistent with the rest of the narrative. All that appears in nature would have come from something pre-existent except light. Surely the writer presupposes that the light of day comes ultimately from the light which surrounds Yahweh. It is worth noticing that, according to the *Bundahish* (i. 23, 25), Ahura Mazda first of all produced Vohûman ('good thought'), and then the sky, after which Vohûman produced the 'light of the world' (see p. 38, note 1).

The next work is heaven, or, as it is more correctly called, the firmament of the heaven. As Jeremias points out,[2] it is the 'bar' (*parku*) which, in the fourth tablet of the epic, is placed in front of the half of Tiâmat's carcase to keep the upper waters in position; also the 'highway of the heaven' (*šupuk same*), as the Babylonians called the firmament. In short, it is the zodiac on which, according to *vv.* 14 *ff.*, the sun, moon, and stars, *i.e.* planets, are placed as 'signs.' As signs of what? Of the will of the gods (cp. Jer. x. 3)—a distinctly Babylonian doctrine, which appeared to divest the power that stands overagainst man of its capricious and unintelligible character.[3] The Priestly Writer retains the conception of the heavenly bodies as 'signs,' but does not explain how he differs from the Babylonians. He also still permits the belief that the sun rules over the day, and the moon over the night (cp. Tablet V. line 12, probably), but does not guard against polytheistic inferences. That the permission was dangerous appears from Job xxxi. 26 *f.* In Talmudic times some of the Jews actually sacrificed to the sun, the moon, and the planets, to which is added the almost divinely sacred name of Michael.[4] Before passing on, let us notice that the present unnatural position of the heavenly bodies, in *vv.* 14-18, after the earth and the plants,

the realm of light' (Max Müller, *Anc. Sanskr. Lit.* p. 562). The Babylonian Creator, Marduk, was a Light-god.

[1] On P's characteristic word for 'create' see *E. Bib.*, col. 954.

[2] *ATAO*, pp. 55, 78.

[3] So Winckler often; see *e.g.* 'Die Weltanschauung des alten Orients,' *Preuss. Jahrbücher*, civ. 231 (1901).

[4] *Hullin*, 40 *a*; *Abodah zarah*, 42 *b*.

must be due to the necessity of bringing the creative works into the scheme of six working days (so Gunkel). The original order was probably what we find in the Babylonian epic. On the distinction between Hebrew and Babylonian cosmology at this point, see Jastrow, *RBA*, pp. 435 *f.*

Now, as to the other creative works. In *v.* 11 Elohim directs that the earth (*i.e.* the dry land) should bring forth plants, and in *vv.* 20, 24 that the waters and the earth should cause living beings to come forth, suitable for each. In *vv.* 26, 27, however, Elohim himself both proposes to create, and actually creates (or rather takes the leading part in the work). Evidently a contrast is intended. As for the plants and the varied animal forms of water and land, their creation can be delegated to lesser beings closely connected with the water or the land (as the case may be). I mean that in the spirit of the earlier narrative, which was distinctly animistic, we may assume that some inferior divine Beings—the future water-gods, plant-gods, and animal-gods—were appointed for this duty.[1] This, I take it, is why in *vv.* 21 and 25 it is said that 'Elohim created great sea-monsters (or serpents),' and that 'Elohim made the beasts of the earth,' etc. Possibly in the original text the verbs here were in the plural; some change, at any rate, seems to have taken place in the text. We may here recall that, according to Berossus, both men and animals were created at Bel's command by one of the other gods.[2] The illustration, I admit, is imperfect, still it is worth something, for it shows that one deity was not supposed in Babylonia to have done everything. One may also refer to the striking representation of the Skidi Pawnees of N. America, which is quite as much a fact as the statement of Berossus. Beyond the clouds, say they, the creator of the universe, Tirawa, together with his consort Atira (maize-maiden), reigns supreme. His mandates, however, are transmitted to men by lesser deities,

[1] Cp. the angels appointed over natural objects (Jubilees ii., Slavonic Enoch, xix. 4).

[2] He is said to have mixed with clay the blood which flowed from the severed head of Bel. The opening lines of Tablet VI. show that the blood of Bel-Marduk himself is meant. See Lagrange, *Religions sémitiques*, ed. i. p. 341.

and through some of these, once upon a time, he created mankind. The first girl and boy were produced by the Evening and Morning Stars, and by the Sun and Moon respectively, while other human beings were created by the gods of the four world-quarters, who, like the analogous deities in Egyptian mythology, were the supports of the sky.[1]

And who were these men? Were they a pair, or several pairs? If they were a single pair, how could it be said, 'Let them rule over the fish of the sea,' etc.? But if they were several pairs, why is it said, 'as the image of Elohim created he him'? There seems here to be an inconsistency, due perhaps to the redactor. That the first man was androgynous is held among moderns, so far as I know, by Schwally alone[2] (changing אתם into אתו). It is, however, more important to remark that these first men were no ordinary men such as we are, but 'the (very) image of Elohim, like unto Elohim' (*v.* 26). For humanity no longer answers completely to this description—humanity has fallen. So, at least, later students thought; the first men must have had endowments which later specimens of the race have lost. Probably they imagined such a being as the Adapa or Adamu (Fossey, Sayce) of Babylonian legend,[3] who is, indeed, a man, but so near godship that some myth-makers could ignore the distinction, and identify him with the god Marduk. Indeed, in the O.T. itself we find distinct references to a first man who was virtually a god. Let us glance at these. One is in Job xv. 7, 8, where Eliphaz sarcastically asks Job if he is the first man, and has caught up the plan of the world in the sessions of the divine council.[4]

[1] Dorsey, *Traditions of the Skidi Pawnee* (1904), Introd. pp. xviii. *f.*

[2] *Archiv für Relig.-wissenschaft*, ix. (1906) 173.

[3] Job may, in fact, have been one of the traditional first men, or one of those primeval heroes who were made directly by God. The name איוב (איבן?) may suggest Ea-bani (= 'Ea made') as that of the original hero. Ea was the god of wisdom. See *E. Bib.*, 'Job.' In *Am. Tab.* 237; 6, 13 we find Aiab as a pers. name in N. Palestine (Cheyne, *Expositor*, 1897, *b*, p. 23).

[4] On Adapa or Adamu, no 'first Adam,' but a special creation, see Lagrange, *Rel. sém.* p. 340. Babylon knows of no 'first man.'

Singularly enough, there is a close parallel to this in Rune iii. of the *Kalevala* (Crawford), where the young singer Youkahainen brags thus to the ancient minstrel Wainamoinen—

> I was present as a hero,
> Sixth of wise and ancient heroes,
> Seventh of primeval heroes,
> When the heavens were created,
> When were formed the ether spaces, etc.

Clearly the first man, according to some primitive thinkers, was not short of divine in his wisdom.

Another is in Ezek. xxviii. 12-17, where we have a mythological picture of the first man in Paradise, which has some degree of affinity (1) to the Babylonian story of Gilgamesh, (2) to the picture in Gen. i. 26-28, and (3) to the Paradise-story in Gen. ii.-iii. We shall have to return to Ezekiel's picture later; here I need only remark that underneath the king of Miṣṣor (as we must doubtless read instead of Ṣor) there is the grand form of the First Man, who is 'full of wisdom and perfect in beauty,' and has the attire of a king or a demi-god. In fact, perfect wisdom and beauty are among the signs of godship. Wisdom is necessary alike for making a world, and for ruling over it when it has been made; beauty either for charming or for awing its inhabitants into obedience. Not for charming alone. For the divine beauty has a special awfulness; the unworthy may not see it unscathed. Naturally, then, the two first men were both wise and beautiful: the first is nameless in the Priestly Writing; the second is Ḥanôk (to be restored, as the original reading, for Noaḥ), whose wisdom and beauty are guaranteed by his converse with Elohim. To both, the royal hero of the Babylonian deluge-myth, Xisuthros (Atra-ḥasīs, 'the very wise'), and the equally royal Yima, who once upon a time ruled over pious men in the Zarathustrian Paradise, are in a high degree parallel.

The First Man, therefore, may be called a God, just as his maker may be called a Man. In Gen. i. 26 (cp. ix. 6) we are told that he was to be the image and likeness of Elohim, and in v. 3 the same phraseology is used of the first

son in relation to the first father.[1] And if there is a sexual distinction in the new-made human nature, was there not also, mythologically, a similar distinction in the nature of the Great Beings (cp. above, on i. 2 *b*)? Further, if it be said that to correspond to the preternatural animal-man who long, long ago preceded the glorious divine Man of the Priestly Writer, and indeed of the Babylonian creation-myths, there must afterwards have been animal-men, not in the same degree preternatural, we need not contradict (see on vi. 1-6). Such a phase of belief there was, and why should not the ancestors of the later Canaanites have passed through it? Heaven and earth, god and man must correspond. So felt, till quite recently, the N. American Indians; so, too, the vastly more cultured Babylonian race. To what marvels of constructive speculation the latter were guided by this conception, no one has shown so clearly as Hugo Winckler.[2]

We now pass on to the question of the plurality of the Elohim. That the Heavenly Man, called by the Priestly Writer in a special sense Elohim, like the men of earth, loved companionship, we have seen already. 'Elohim said, Let *us* make man.' Surely there is no figure of speech here, as if Elohim were taking counsel with himself. When such a case does arise, it does not appear that the plural is used.[3] To understand the passage, we must take it with parallel passages, such as (iii. 22,) xi. 7, Isa. vi. 8, to which we may add the story of the visit of the three 'men' to Abraham in chap. xviii. I venture to think it practically certain that in an earlier form of this story the three 'men' represented a divine triad or trinity, which acted after deliberating in council, though one of its members was superior in rank to the rest. The notion will perhaps strike some as heathenish. It is, however, in harmony with the

[1] The Egyptians elaborated the theory of the humanity of God in a tasteless way (see Maspero, *Dawn of Civ.* p. 110). On Ezek. i. 27 see Gressmann, *Eschatologie*, pp. 51 *f.*

[2] See the essay already mentioned, *Preuss. Jahrbücher*, civ. (1901), especially pp. 261 *f.*

[3] Cp. Gen. viii. 21, 'Yahweh said to his heart.' The reference is at any rate valid against a textual conservative like Ed. König (*Syntax*, § 207).

fundamental belief of the Semitic East that heaven and earth are in the closest correspondence. An earthly king had his wider and his narrower circle of councillors, in imitation, as was supposed, of the heavenly pattern. The wider heavenly council consisted of the benê Elohim, or inferior divinities (1 K. xxii. 19-22, Job i. 6, ii. 1, xxxviii. 7; cp. Rev. iv. 4). The narrower one was limited to the Divine Three,[1] the chief of whom can be no other than the great Yahweh himself, while the second and third are honourably subjected divinities, whose worship the Israelites had learned from the N. or E. Arabians. The names of the latter are Ashḥur or Ashtar and Yarḥam or Yerahme'el (see below)—divinities already closely associated before they were subordinated to Yahweh. In fact, divine duads rather than triads are characteristic of Canaan. It is probable, too, that the inner divine council was often, in the mind of the Hebrew narrators, a duad[2] rather than a triad (see below, on 'Mal'ak Yahweh'). But, whether triad or duad, the Divine Companions were doubtless imagined as living together in the fullest harmony.

I have here assumed that a time came when progressive Israelites were agreed that among the Divine Three there was no goddess. This may be illustrated by the fact that the Zenjirli (N. Syrian) inscriptions refer only to gods. It is, however, extremely probable that one member of the Divine Company of Gen. xviii. is the transformation of a goddess. The primitive Semitic deity was certainly a goddess—the great 'mother-goddess' Ashtart. It was this deity who was worshipped at the very ancient Semitic temple, the remains of which Petrie claims to have found at Serabît-el-Khâdem.[3] For we can hardly fail to agree with

[1] Three, because of Gen. xviii.; cp. also the triads of Egypt and Babylonia. Anu, Bel, and Ea formed a triad as early as 3000 B.C. Later Jewish speculation, however, recognised companies of four and of seven Mighty Ones. Saturninus, the Gnostic, of Antioch, taught that the world was produced by seven angels (Hippolyt. *Refut.* vii. 28). The Ophites spoke of a holy hebdomad, whose chief was Yaldabaoth, the God of the Jews (Iren. *adv. haer.* i. 30. 9, 10).

[2] So the great unifier of Babylonia recognises specially Anu and Bel (see Jastrow, *RBA*, p. 147).

[3] *Researches in Sinai* (1906), p. 192.

this explorer that the Hat-hor ('Mistress of Turquoise') here worshipped was really Ashtart. As Barton has shown, the Semitic father-god was but a transformation of the mother-goddess, and the Kenites, whose disciples the tribes led by 'Moses' were, must have worshipped Ashtart beside the great god commonly known as Yahweh.[1] So that even in N. Arabia the Hebrews were the worshippers of a goddess, and when they advanced into Canaan their attachment to this cult would naturally grow and develop. For the Canaanites, like the Phœnicians, were devoted to Ashtart. This appears plainly enough from the results of the excavations. It is true there are many O.T. texts which describe the worship of the Baals and the Ashtarts as apostasy, but such statements are admittedly due to illusion.

This is not the place to consider the Baalim. As to the local Ashtarts, the traces of their worship in the O.T. would no doubt be larger[2] but for the scribes and the redactors, and some of the original evidence of its existence can still (as we shall see) be recovered. From the phrase 'Ashtart, the abomination (goddess) of the Sidonians' (1 K. xi. 5, 2 K. xxiii. 13), one might be led to suppose that the cultus was an importation from Phœnicia in the time of Solomon, who, it is said, 'went after Ashtart and Milkom.' This, however, would be an error. From Judg. ii. 13, x. 6, 1 S. vii. 3, 4, xii. 10, however, as well as from the recent excavations, it appears that it is of earlier date than this. Judg. x. 6 deserves special attention, because after 'the Baals and the Ashtarts' come the words 'the gods of Aram and the gods of Sidon.' Now, both Aram and Sidon have two possible meanings. They may refer to regions or districts either on the northern or on the southern border of the Israelites. It is contended here that the most natural view is that which makes them southern regions, and that the settled parts of N. Arabia were the source and centre of the cultus referred to. See, further, on 'Ashteroth Karnaim,' xiv. 5.

But besides the passages in which mention is plainly made

[1] *Semitic Origins*, p. 290.

[2] Barton, too, remarks on the scantiness of the O.T. references to Ashtoreth ('Ashtoreth,' etc., *JBL* x., 1891, p. 73).

of Ashtart or the Ashtarts, as worshipped by the backsliding Israelites, there are passages enough in which the goddess Ashtart is referred to under one or another of her titles incorrectly transmitted. (*a*) One is 'Malkah of Ishmael,'[1] *i.e.* the heavenly queen worshipped in Ishmaelite or Yeraḥme'elite Arabia (cp. 'Ishtar of Nineveh,' 'Ishtar of Arbela'). This title is traditionally misrepresented in Jer. vii. 18, xliv. 17-19, 25, as 'queen of heaven,' precisely as (if I may differ from the prevalent theory) 'Baal of Ishmael' has been altered into 'Baal of heaven' by Phœnician priests adopting and sanctioning an error of the scribes or sculptors (cp. p. 45), and precisely as 'the god of Ishmael' has been altered sometimes in the O.T. into 'god of heaven' (see on Gen. xxiv. 7), and 'the idol of Ishmael' into 'the abomination that makes desolate' (Dan. xii. 11; cp. ix. 27, xi. 3). Malkah is, of course, the feminine of Melek or Malk (see p. 51). I may notice, however, that the various reading מלאכת implied by the points, and by many MSS. as well as Pesh., may perhaps represent ירחמאלית, in which case שמים must of course be rejected. Cp. below, on Mal'ak.

(*b*) Other titles are 'the Ishmaelitess,' 'the Ashkalitess,' 'the Meshek goddess,' 'the Arabian,' which are disguised in MT. as Bosheth,[2] Ashmath,[3] Sukkoth,[4]

[1] שמים (שמם) for ישמ', as *e.g.* in Gen xi. 4, xlix. 25. Cp. also Σαμημ-ρουμος in Philo of Byblus, a compound of two corrupt forms, one representing ישמ', the other ארם = ירחמ'.

[2] בשת, as a designation of the consort of Baal, Jer. iii. 23, Hos. ix. 10, is pointed by Jastrow (*JBL*, 1894, pp. 19 *ff.*) בֻּשֶׁת; he regards it as the name of a Babylonian deity, and compares the personal name Mutibashti, which, however, can be explained otherwise. The usual view is that 'Bosheth' (as tradition points) means 'shame'—a disparaging substitute for 'Ba'al.' But how comes the Chronicler to give 'Eshba'al' ('Ishba'al'?) rather than 'Ishbosheth'? The truth probably is that בשת = שבעית = ישמעאלית. The same explanation may apply to the Phœn. אבסת (Cooke, pp. 69, 91), also to the Heb. אי[ש]בשת. Cp. ישב and יבש often from ישמעאל.

[3] אשמת, Am. viii. 14, is another corruption of ישמ'. The parallelism shows this (see pp. 46 *f.*). Cp. אשימא, 2 K. xvii. 30.

[4] סכת (MT. Sukkōth), in the title of the great autumn festival. 'Booths' is highly improbable, nor is anything said about dwelling in booths in Dt. xvi. 13-15. Originally it was the festival of Ashtart, as the goddess of fruit-producing trees. סכת comes from אַשְׁכָּלֶת, the fem. of אֶשְׁכָּל (= Asshur-yeraḥme'el); see on Gen. xiv. 13. We also find

Zenuth,[1] Mazzaloth,[2] Tammuz,[3] Maskith[o],[4] Shulammith,[5] ʿArbith,[6] and Ṣebā'ōth.[7] I must here appeal to fair-minded readers. The objections to the usual explanations of the passages referred to are exceedingly strong. If any one can overcome them, I will return to conservative textual views. But the variety of explanations tried is already so great that I can hardly conceive of new ones. Take for instance the phrase י׳ צבאות, which Gressmann has lately called 'altogether unintelligible.' It *seems* indeed to mean 'Yahweh of the hosts.' But we

סכת בנת (ו superfluous) in 2 K. xvii. 30, as the deity of the N. Arabian Bābel (see on Gen. x. 10). בנת should no doubt be תַּבְנִת, the first ת omitted, as if dittographed. ת׳ means 'the Temanite goddess' (see p. 45).

[1] זונות, Hos. iv. 11 (a didactic maxim, clearly corrupt). The preceding word לשמר covers over שמלת; so also does זונות. 'The Ishmaelitess, Yaman, and Ashtar steal the mind.' Cp. בית זונה, Jer. v. 7, where זונה comes from צבענה (= Ishmaelitess). Cp. זונה in Judg. xi. 1, and perhaps Josh. ii. 1; also *Crit. Bib.* on 1 K. xxii. 38.

[2] מזלות, 2 K. xxiii. 5. Neither 'signs of the zodiac,' nor 'mansions (*manzalti*) of the great gods' will suit. מ׳ should really be combined with בעל. 'Sun and moon' is a gloss. Read משלית = ישמ׳. The well-known title again. Cp. (7) and ומזמים = ישמעאלים; also זבול and זבוב = ישמ׳.

[3] תמוז, Ezek. viii. 14. 'Women weeping for the Tammuz' cannot be called probable. We rather expect (Jer. vii. 18, etc.) the worship of the 'queen of Ishmael' (tradition, 'of heaven'), and this is ratified by textual criticism. תמוז, like מזלות, comes from ישמ׳. Read מברכות, not מבכות.

[4] [מ]שכית[ו], Ezek. viii. 12. Unintelligible in MT. Read מַשְׁכִּית, *i.e.* the Meshek-goddess. See on 'Meshek,' Gen. x. 2.

[5] Possibly שולמית (MT. Shulammith), in Cant. vi. 13, represents שלמת = ישמעאלית, on the supposition that Canticles is based on a cycle of songs relative to the myth of Adonis and his sister-spouse. See p. 47.

[6] ערבית, in the phrase ארון [ה]ברית, 1 S. iv. 4, etc., which, like א׳ העדות, is suspicious. Sometimes the Deuteronomist is supposed to have coined the phrase, and later writers are presumed to have interpolated ברית or הברית in earlier passages. This, however, is but a makeshift hypothesis. We also find ערבית, miswritten (*a*) as איביך, given as a gloss on צבעית (see 11), and (*b*) as רבבות in Num. x. 35 *f.* It is probable, too, that בעל ברית in Judg. viii. 33, ix. 4, and אל ב׳ in Judg. ix. 46, are corruptions of ירחמאל ערבית, the two members of a divine duad being combined. The difficulties of commentators are thus, I hope, removed. Cp. p. 35.

[7] Independently Erbt (*Die Hebräer*, p. 185) has advocated a similar view. He would read צָבָאת, 'the warrior-goddess,' *i.e.* Asherah. But the great goddess was not primarily a warrior. Josh. v. 13 throws no real light on the name.

know from 1 S. iv. 4, 2 S. vi. 2, that it was the name of the god of the ark (if ארון, 'ark,' be correct), and any one can see that such a name as this for such a god is, to say the least, improbable. Analogy suggests that צבאות must occupy the place of some proper name; in short, that י׳ צ׳ is the incorrect form of a compound divine name. What we expect instead of צבאות is the name of a goddess (p. 17), and considering (*a*) the evidence of the 'Stone of Job,'[1] (*b*) that שבא and שבע are both derivatives of ישמע[אל], and (*c*) that צ sometimes certainly takes the place of ש (*e.g.* in צבעים and צבאים, צבעון, צוען, צלמנע, it is natural to read צבעית (=צבענית), and to explain it 'Ishmaelitess.'[2] It is worth noticing again that, according to Num. x. 35, 36 (the text is corrupt, but can be restored), the name Yahweh might be combined equally well with צבעית and with ערבית. That the higher teachers of Israel at an early period induced their disciples to read the safer word (with ו instead of י) can be easily understood. See on מלאך י׳, pp. 58 *ff.*

A third title most probably underlies the phrase *rūăḥ ĕlōhīm* in Gen. ii. 2 *b*. We have already seen that the clause as a whole must refer to one of the co-workers in creation, and that this mighty worker was represented in the form of a (female) bird. From this it follows that *rūăḥ ĕlōhīm* cannot be the original reading. What this phrase usually means we know. It denotes a potent divine energy, materialistically conceived, which stirs human nature to its depths, and (in the later books) produces and sustains life (see Driver's note). Here, however, it is an original cosmic power that comes before us hypostasized, and for this there is only one complete parallel, viz. the difficult passage, Isa. xl. 13. Indeed, there is no secure evidence that the *rūăḥ*, whatever be its functions, was ever hypostasized, 1 K. xxii. 19 *ff.*, Isa. lxiii. 10, 11, 14, Ps. cvi. 33, as well as Isa. xl. 13, being most probably corrupt.[3]

[1] The so-called 'Stone of Job,' discovered beyond the Jordan, seems to attest the worship of a Canaanitish goddess called Kana-z(or ṣ)apant. For the latter part of this compound name (ṣapant) is surely צפנת, 'Ṣephōnīth' = Ṣibʿōnīth ('Ishmaelitess').

[2] See on Ṣibeʿon, xxxvi. 20.

[3] In 1 K. הרוח represents ירחמאל, as the God of prophecy (prophecy most probably came from Arabia). In Isa., רוח קדשו and רוח יהוה have

There is but one adequate solution: *rūăḥ ĕlōhīm* must represent a compound divine name, one of the elements in which must be the name of a goddess. 'Elohim' may be either a substitute for 'Yeraḥme'el' or (a later usage) an equivalent for 'Yahweh'; the latter alternative is preferable. *Rūăḥ* therefore must have arisen out of the name of a goddess, and we can now see who that goddess must have been—'Ashtart' (the Bab. Ishtar),[1] who, though not the wife of Baal-ishmael (Baal-shamem) or Baal-ḥammān (Baal-yeraḥme'el), was at any rate his 'name,' *i.e.* 'equivalent' (Eshmunazar's inscription, *l.* 18). Her sacred animal at Sidon was the cow, in Cyprus the sheep, in Syria the dove. But she could not be confined to these manifestations. As a cosmogonic deity it was fit that she should assume the shape of an eagle. Originally, perhaps (like Anu), a chthonic deity, she rose to the rank of lady of heaven, celestial virgin, and, as Ishtar is styled in a Babylonian hymn, 'mother of the gods, fulfiller of the commands of Bel, producer of verdure, lady of mankind, mother Ishtar.'[2]

But surely *rūăḥ* cannot have arisen out of *'Ashtart*? Of course not. But the goddess had various titles, and one of them, we may infer from Gen. i. 2 critically regarded, was Yarḥith, the short for Yeraḥme'elith. The latter word was probably written *Yeraḥ'*, out of which, by an easy modification, an early editor produced *rūăḥ*. Parallels for this change lie close at hand. Besides the passages mentioned above (1 K. xxii. 19, etc.), I may refer to three other passages in Genesis itself (iii. 6 *a*, vi. 3, vii. 22), another passage in Kings (1 K. xviii. 12, see p. 33), and another in 'Isaiah' (xlviii. 16). In Babylonia, too, the goddess Ishtar had other names; in fact, the various female goddesses pass into each other so readily that we are led to conclude with Hommel that there was but one Babylonian goddess, viz. Ishtar. One of these apparently distinct goddesses was Ba'u, who is really a double of Ishtar, and

both sprung from ירחמאל יהוה (note מלאך, *v.* 9, and see on מלאך יהוה, Gen. xvi. 7). Similarly רוחו in Ps. cvi. is = 'רוח י, *i.e.* ירח' יהוה.

[1] Note that the Mandæans equated the Holy Spirit with Istra-Libat, *i.e.* Ishtar-Dilbat (Brandt, *Mand. Schriften*, p. 45).

[2] Quoted by Driver in Hast. *DB*, 'Ashtoreth.'

whose name may have journeyed to N. Arabia and Canaan —for names journeyed to, as well as from, these countries. Consequently the cosmogonic goddess may perhaps have been known as Ba'u-Yarḥith. To justify this, let us look somewhat closely at *v.* 2 *a*, והארץ היתה תהו ובהו. The occurrence of the terms תהו and בהו is limited to later writings (including Isa. xxix. 21 ; see my *Intr. Is.* p. 195). תהו may be correctly spelt, but hardly בהו. This word is surely the B*aav* of Philo of Byblus, who is the mother of Α*ἰών* and Π*ρωτόγονος*. These two are really but one, viz. עלם, *i.e.* ישמעאל, while B*aav* is the Bab. Ba'u,[1] who is virtually identified with Belit,[2] and is called 'daughter of Anu (the heaven-god),' a title also expressly given to Ishtar. That a scribe should have assimilated באו to תהו, is only natural.

Thus we get as a near approach to the original form of Gen. i. 2 *b*, 'and Yarḥith-Yahweh was brooding over the face of the waters.' How the cosmic egg was brought in, can be conjectured. Philo of Byblus says that the egg split and the earth, the heaven, and the celestial bodies emerged. A more first-hand authority for primitive imaginations says—

> From one half the egg, the lowest,
> Grows the nether vault of Terra ;
> From the upper half remaining
> Grows the upper vault of heaven.[3]

Now, too, we can perhaps see how to read *v.* 2 *a*, viz. והארץ וגו׳, 'now the earth was chaos,' to which is added ובהו, or rather הוא באו, 'that is, Bau,' a misplaced gloss on ירחית. Nor can we be surprised that בהו should occur only twice elsewhere, viz. Jer. iv. 23 (where, however, Duhm and Cornill deny it) and Isa. xxxiv. 11.

We see, then, that a time came when it was instinctively felt by the best Israelites that the mother-goddess, who watched over the earth's fertility, belonged to an earlier

[1] According to Zimmern and Jastrow, there is no connexion between Ba'u and Bohu. But, then, these scholars think that 'Bohu,' like Tohu, means chaos, which is not here maintained.

[2] See Hommel, *Gr.* p. 114, note 4.

[3] *The Kalevala*, by Crawford, Rune i.

stratum of thought, and that society now demanded a father-god. Such a change, for which there are numerous parallels, corresponds, as Barton has shown, to a new stage of family development. The goddess had been called (neglecting the distinction between א and ע)[1] Ashtart. The name of the god was Ashtar (?), or Ashḥur, or Yeshūrūn, or perhaps Ashēr. Let me first speak of Ashḥur. The name is traceable not only in the O.T., but also in a hitherto unexplained N. Syrian divine name, viz. Arḳu-resheph, in the Hadad Zenjirli inscription, *l.* 11 (Cooke, p. 161). Arḳu is to be grouped with the Phœnician personal name ערק (Cooke, p. 88), and with the ethnic ערקי, Gen. x. 17 (see note). The feminine form Ashḥoreth (= Ashtart) was also perhaps known in Phœnicia (see on Melḳarth, p. 46). The name can readily be explained on the analogy of compound names such as אשדוד (Ashdod), אשקנז (Ashkenaz), אשכל (Ashkal; MT. Eshcol), אשקלון (Ashkelon), אשבעל (Ashbaʿal; MT. Eshbaal), אשבן (Ashban; MT. Eshban); in all of which אש takes the place of אֲשֵׁר. The second element, חור, often occurs in the O.T. as a proper name, and in most of these cases it is evident that the name is N. Arabian. There are also Aramæan names into which the element חור enters, as we learn partly from Aramaic, partly from cuneiform documents.[2] It may be best explained as a weakened form of חמר, which, like חמור (Gen. xxxiii. 19) and רחם (1 Chr. ii. 44), is certainly an offshoot of ירחם = ירחמאל (see below). Ashḥur will therefore mean Asshur-yeraḥme'el,[3] a name applied both to a district of the large Yeraḥme'elite region (see on ii. 14), and to the El or divinity of the district. It was natural, therefore, that on the way to Shur (*i.e.* Asshur) the forlorn Hagar should meet the friendly divinity known as Asshur-Yeraḥme'el. See on Gen. xvi. 13*f.*

[1] The distinction referred to is not kept up in the writing of proper names in the O.T. texts. See further, Zimmern, *KAT*[3], p. 420, with note 5.

[2] See S. A. Cook, *Aram. Gloss.*; Johns, *Ass. Deeds*, iii. 537; and *PEF Quart. St.*, 1905, p. 240 (on Gezer Tablet). As-ḥor, however, in the Aramaic papyri of Assuan is an Egyptian name ('belonging to Horus').

[3] We need not therefore refer to the goddess Ishḥara = Ishtar (*KAT*, p. 432; Hommel, *Gr.* p. 41, note 2).

Note also in the parallel passage, באשר הוא שם, from בְּאַשֻּׁר הוא ישמ׳, 'in Asshur, that is, Ishmael' (xxi. 17 *b*).

Asshur as a divine name is more frequent than Ashḥur, and as a regional name is even common. As a divine name it was first noticed by Hommel[1] in Dt. xxxiii. 29, where we should read (after 'by Yahweh'), '[Yahweh] is the shield which is thy help, and Asshur the sword which is thy pride.' So in Gen. xvii. 1, 'I am El Shaddai' should be 'I am El Asshur,' and similarly wherever Shaddai occurs we should read, not Shēdī, 'my dæmon' (as Nöldeke), but 'Asshur' (see on Gen. xlix. 25); 'Yeshurun,' too, is probably a modification of Asshur with a termination indicating attachment. And lastly, in Ex. iii. 14 אהיה both times has probably sprung from אשחור, so that Elohim says to Moses, 'Tell the benê Israel, Ashḥur has sent me unto you.'[2] See also Gen. xxxi. 29, 42, 53, where critical emendation is indispensable.

The question may perhaps be asked, Was the god Asshur or Ashḥur originally a tree-spirit? One thing at any rate is clear. The tree-symbol of the original El-Asshur was the asshur-tree, also known as *tĕasshūr* (Isa. xli. 19, etc.) and probably as *'eṣ ra'aman*, 'the ra'aman tree' (see p. 33, note 2). In Dt. xvi. 21, where the impossible אשרה כל-עץ should be כל-עץ אֲשֻׁחֹר, there is a confusion between the asshur-tree planted near the altar of Baal (*i.e.* Asshur-Yeraḥme'el) and the symbol of Baal's divine companion, who is often called Asherah. An equally unfortunate mistake occurs in Lev. xvii. 7 and 2 Chr. xi. 15, where שעירים, 'satyrs,' has supplanted אַשֻּׁרִים,[3] symbols of the god Asshur, and in 2 K. xxiii. 8, where 'Asshurim' has become שְׁעָרִים, 'gates,' also in Dt. xxxii. 17, Ps. cvi. 37, where 'Asshurim' has become שֵׁדִים, 'demi-gods' (?). We have also to consider our position with regard to 'Asher,' 'Asherah,' 'Asherim,' and 'Asheroth.' The most natural view is that 'Asher,' with a plural 'Asherim,' is a collat. form of 'Asshur,' and 'Asherah,' with a plural 'Asheroth,' of 'Asshurith.'[4] Possibly, however, the

[1] *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*, ii. 209; cp. Barton, *Sem. Or.* p. 249.

[2] In Ex. iii. 14 אהיה אשר אהיה יאמר is a later insertion, partly scribal, partly redactional. See *ad loc.*

[3] Cp. on 'Seir,' Gen. xiv. 6.

[4] Cp. Wellhausen, *Comp. des Hex.*(2) p. 11.

distinction between 'Asherim' and 'Asheroth' may not have been present to the editors of the texts. At any rate, we find 'Asherim' and 'Ḥammanim' mentioned together (Isa. xvii. 8, xxvii. 9), and the presumption is that the 'Asherim' are symbols of 'Asher' = Asshur, and the 'Ḥammanim' symbols of Raḥman (Rimmon) = Yeraḥme'el.[1]

Thus between 'Asher,' 'Asshur,' and 'Yeraḥme'el' (see below) there was no real difference, and when in Ex. iii. 14 'Asshur' is said to be the sender of Moses it is as if the divine name had been Yeraḥme'el. It was therefore possible for the Canaanitish goddess Ashratu or Ashirtu (= Ashērah) to be represented as the consort of Rammân.[2] Probably the people explained Ashratu or Ashērah as 'the propitious' (√אשר = ישר), just as they must have explained Raḥman (= Yeraḥme'el) as 'the compassionate.'

We now pass on to Ashtar (אשתר) or 'Ashtar (עשתר). The latter form (which Hoffmann explains as 'the luxuriant')[3] occurs in Mesha's inscr. (l. 17) in combination with Kĕmōsh, and most scholars have supposed that 'Ashtar here is = 'Ashtart. Surely this is an error. Lagrange's argument that the Moabites, being so near the Canaanites, would naturally regard 'Ashtar as a goddess,[4] will not stand, for the Canaanites expressed the fem. gender by the form 'Ashtart. It is true the Ishtar of Babylonia and Assyria was a goddess. But why should we suppose that the tendency which led the Canaanites to differentiate by appending the fem. ending did not extend to Moab? I hold, therefore, with Barton,[5] in opposition to Baethgen, Moore, and Lagrange, that the 'Ashtar of King Mesha is a masculine form, like the Sabæan עתתר; and if so, it will be only natural to find traces of the cultus of this 'Ashtar (or Ashtar) among the Israelites and the Phœnicians.

[1] It is a mistake to render 'Baal-ḥammān' (the chief god of Punic N. Africa) 'the glowing Baal.' It is = Baal-Yarḥam.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Rimmon'; Jensen, *Hittiter u. Armenier* (1898), pp. 172 *f.*; Zimmern, *KAT*[3], pp. 433 *f.* Hommel (*Exp. T.* xi. 190; cp. *Gr.* p. 85) thinks that Asherah = S. Arabian Athirat, the wife of the moon-god.

[3] From √עשר = Aram. עתר, 'to be rich' (*Ueb. ein. phön. Inschr.* p. 22). Similarly Hommel (*Gr.* p. 89, note 1).

[4] *Religions sémitiques* (1903), p. 125. [5] *Sem. Or.* pp. 141 *ff.*

Our expectation is not disappointed, though in Phœnician we can only point to עבד עשתר in an inscription from Kition (Cooke, p. 72); there is surely no necessity to identify this with the more common עבדעשתרת. In the O.T. we may refer to Dt. iii. 17, iv. 49, Josh. x. 40, xii. 3, 8, xiii. 20, where we find a word אשדות of which no satisfactory explanation is forthcoming (see *BDB*, and Ges.-Buhl). Its origin, however, ought to be clear; it comes either from אשתר or from אשתרות. The former is preferable because of אשד in Num. xxi. 15,[1] which comes either from אִשֵּׁר or from אשתר. As in the case of Ashḥur, the name was applied both to a district and to the divinity of the district. We also find אשתר underlying תירוש in Hos. iv. 11 (see p. 19, note 1), and the second part of the name בנתרש in an Aramaic papyrus (Assuan, A 19), and also underlying ראשית in an impossible phrase in Am. vi. 1, where נִקְבֵי ראשית הגוים should be בִּקְעֵי אשתר גלעדים.[2] And further on we shall see that the traditional resting-place of the ark was on the mountains (mountain?) of Ashtar. We can well believe that the city and district referred to were devoted to the God Ashtar. Nor is it impossible that our method may reveal to us unexpected traces of the primitive importance of this deity. ארון העדת (Ex. xxv. 22) and אהל העדות (Num. ix. 15, xvii. 23) may have come from ארון עשתר and אהל עש׳ respectively, just as אהל מועד (Ex. xxvii. 21, etc.) and הר מועד (Isa. xiv. 13) may have come from אהל רעמן and הר ר׳ (Raʿaman = Yeraḥme'el). Indeed, ארון itself may cover over a divine name (see p. 34). Whether לחת העדת (Ex. xxxi. 18) once meant 'tablets inscribed by Ashtar,' is uncertain.

I confess that this theory seems to me not unplausible, though it may be doubted whether עדת or עדות has not rather come from the fem. form עשתרת. As we have seen, the ark (if 'ark' be right) was specially connected with Yahweh-Shemaʿith (underlying Y.-Ṣebā'ōth), *i.e.* Yahweh-Ashtart. עשתרת may have been written עֹרֶת; such abbreviations were always natural. I willingly admit that the

[1] For אשר הנחלים read אשתר ירחמאל, dropping the final ם in הנ׳ as due to a scribe's error.

[2] See *Hibbert Journal*, iii. 831.

mistaken reading עדת or עדות for עשתר or עשתרת must be ancient; but how many other mistaken readings must be comparatively ancient! In Ex. xxv. 16, 21 *f.*, xxx. 6, and in the Psalms, עדות must be the original reading, and must mean 'law.' But there are certain phrases in which the name of a deity seems called for. For instance, in Ex. xvi. 34 'before the Law' is not a suitable parallel to 'before Yahweh' (*v.* 33). Nor is 'ark of the Law,' 'tent of the Law,' 'dwelling-place (משכן) of the Law' nearly as natural as 'ark—tent—dwelling-place of Ashtar or (Ashtart).'[1] Nor is the phrase 'the tablets of Ashtar (or Ashtart)' at all unsuitable. There is sufficient evidence (see p. 38, note 2) that Ashtart was sometimes regarded as the goddess of wisdom, and we may assume that Ashtar (who grew out of Ashtart), as well as his fellows, Yeraḥme'el and Yahweh, was also honoured as such.

That there should only be well-disguised traces of Ashtar, need not surprise us. He was in fact overshadowed by his divine companion Yeraḥme'el. Let us now consider the name Yeraḥme'el. Its original meaning escapes us. But the people no doubt explained it as 'God has compassion'; there is an allusion to this certainly in Hos. i. 6 and ii. 3 (1), where the writer alludes to Yeraḥme'el as an element in the compound name of Israel's God, and probably in Hos. i. 10, where (to harmonise with the context) בני אל חי should be corrected into בני ירחמאל. It is probable, too, that the רמון of Damascus and the Ramman of Babylonia and Assyria both come from ירחמאל through one of the two possible linking forms רחמן (popularly, 'compassionate') and רעמן (popularly, 'thunderer'). But what was the original meaning of the name? May it mean 'moon . . .'? Hommel (*Gr.* p. 95, note 3) suggests, 'the moon truly is God,' and explains Abimael similarly as 'my father truly is God' (so too Ulmer). These explanations, however, are forced (see on Gen. x. 28). 'Truly' for *ma* is suspicious, and, though 'moon' for ירח is plausible, the isolated appearance of a moon-god ירח on a Phœnician seal[2] would be strange, and it should be observed that the god ירחבול on a

[1] The same remark may be made on the phrase ארון הברית (see p. 35).
[2] Ed. Meyer, *E. Bib.*, 'Phœnicia,' § 11 (*TSBA* v. 456).

Palmyrene inscription is apparently a sun-god (Cooke, p. 280). It is true, 'Sinai' is commonly derived from the Babylonian Sin, as if it meant the moon-mountain. But this theory, though cleverly supported by Winckler (*E. Bib.*, 'Sinai'), is an unsound one. Both 'Sinai' and the ethnic 'Sini' (Gen. x. 17) have quite another origin (see on Ex. iii. 1). Besides, with all deference to Hommel, the *m* in Yeraḥme'el has to be plausibly accounted for. It might, indeed, be due to 'mimation'[1] (so Sayce). But when a letter holds out so firmly in the various derived forms as the *m* (see *e.g.* Aram, Ram, Raḥam, Ḥamūel, Ḳemūel, Melaḥ, Leḥem, Amalek, Yeroḥam, Karmel), it is natural to regard it as radical. The final *-el* (as in all similar cases) is purely formative. Sometimes it is neglected; we find the forms Yirḥam or Yarḥam. Other forms are Raḥam, Rikbo and Rekeb, Melek, Yaman, Yeraḥ.[2] The last of these would account for a Phœnician divine name Yeraḥ; the last but one for the Babylonian god-name Yām;[3] the last but two for the Phœnician god-names usually read respectively Milk and Mukl (see pp. 50*f*). Rikbo (from Rakbul, see on Ex. xv. 1) throws light on the difficult רכבאל in the Hadad and Panammu inscriptions (see Cooke). This deity was one of the great gods of Ya'di in N. Syria; his name means neither chariot nor charioteer of El, but, like the Palmyrene ירחבול (Cooke, p. 278), is a corruption of ירחמאל. Cultus and name were transferred to N. Syria from Arabia. Raḥam, too, which in the O.T. (1 Chr. ii. 44) and in the Assuan papyri (רחמרע = רחם ערב?) is only a personal or clan-name, occurs in a (late) Palmyrene inscription as the name of one of the three 'good gods.'

But a longer pause is needful at the form Yarḥam. Yarḥamu occurs on contract-tablets dated under Shamshu-iluna (Sayce). We also often find ירחם (MT. Yeroḥam) as a personal name, and at least once as a part of the full name of the God of Israel. This is in Ex. xxii. 19, a passage which rewards a careful study. Holzinger is right in declining to cancel (after Sam.) the closing words בלתי

[1] Hommel accounts similarly for 'Milkom' (*Gr.* p. 163, note 4).

[2] Other modifications will be referred to later.

[3] Hommel, *Gr.* p. 130, note 1; p. 178, note 4. We find a personal name Yama in *Am. Tab.* 238, 2.

ליהוה לבדו, though they have no proper connexion with what precedes. His reason is that יחרם is not a suitable word; in the earlier period it was bodies of men, not individuals, who were devoted by the *ḥerem*. What we expect is מות יומת. May not יחרם have come from אחרים, the verb at the end having fallen out? This, however, leaves בלתי וגו׳ unaccounted for. It has not been observed that בלתי may, as in Isa. x. 4, have come from תובל or אתבעל, *i.e.* ישמעאל, and that in the true text 'Ishmael' sometimes occurs as a gloss on ירחמאל, the two names being equivalent. In the present case, בלתי is preceded by יחרם, and it is a natural suggestion (transposing ח and ר) that this word is the shortened form of Yeraḥme'el. To supply מות יומת is needlessly violent. Prefix ת to זבח (the preceding group of letters is closed by ת), restore יהוה for אלהים, and omit the two *glosses* (בלתי, *i.e.* אתבעל, on ירחם, and ליהוה on לאלהים), and you get this precept, תזבח ליהוה ירחם לבדו, 'thou shalt sacrifice to Yahweh-Yarḥam alone.' Can our more conservative scholars suggest an equally adequate remedy? Where Holzinger has failed, it is not likely that they will succeed.

That Yarḥam sometimes takes the form of *Yam*, has been already shown (see p. 28). This enables us in passing to suggest a better explanation for the form אֲבִיָּם in 1 K. xiv. 31, xv. 1, 7 *f.* The *m* is not due to 'mimation' (Kittel). As in the case of the proper names in cuneiform texts closing with *yâma* or *yâmi*, or beginning with *Yam*,[1] it seems best to explain יָם as the short either for ירחם or for ימן. The name is really of geographical origin; it means 'Arabia of Yarḥam'; though of course a conventional religious meaning may, even in Abijam's time, have been attached to the name.

On the name which is equivalent to, and often a gloss on, Yeraḥme'el, viz. Yishmael, not much can be said. Its true meaning appears to be unknown. From the Assyrian name Ishmanni-Adadi[2] one may perhaps infer that there was a god Ishman; now Ishman certainly is = Ishmael. But this throws no light on the origin of the name, and the theories

[1] Including the Aḥiyâmi (= Ashḫur-yaman) in an important letter found by Sellin at Tell Ta'annek. [2] Johns, *Deeds*, p. 398.

mentioned elsewhere (see on xvi. 11) are insecure. The people, no doubt, explained it as = 'God hears.' Cp. the Phœnician name שמעבעל, for which, however, Διοπείθης is the Greek equivalent; also the Assyrian name Ishme-iln, which H. Ranke[1] proposes to interpret 'God heard' or 'God has (this time) heard.' Another form of 'Ishmael' is probably עזבעל, a Phœnician name (Cooke, pp. 347, 350), and also underlying the בעז (𝔊ᴮ βαλαζ) of 1 K. vii. 21.[2] That בעז is connected with זבול is pointed out in *E. Bib.* col. 2304. Now זבול is = ישמעאל (*Crit. Bib.* p. 353). Another form is עזאזל, Lev. xvi. 8 (see on אוזל, Gen. x. 27). Yeraḥme'el (or Ishmael) having become a Pluto, it was natural that Ishmael, in one of its forms, should become the name of a harmful demon in the wilderness. See pp. 53 *f.*

The functions and attributes of the divinity called Yarḥam or Yeraḥme'el were very various. It is necessary to draw a distinction between the god of the nomadic and the god of the agricultural stage. Some traces of the former are still discernible. (*a*) It was from this god that the later Yeraḥme'el, and consequently also Yahweh, derived the titles of '*elohim* of the mountains' and 'inhabitant of Sinai,'[3] probably also (see below) those of 'Baal of the mountains' (Ζεὺς ὄρειος) and 'Baʿal-Lebanon.' (*b*) He was also the god of the storms which rage in the southern mountains (Isa. xxi. 1, Zech. ix. 14), and which seemed to ancient worshippers to declare the presence of their God (Ezek. i. 4, Ṣāphōn-Ishmael, 1 K. xix. 11); also of the fire, whether of lightning (Isa. xxx. 30, 1 K. xviii. 38) or of an active volcano[4] (cp. Ex. iii. 2?, xix. 18, Dt. iv. 11, ix. 15). (*c*) He must also have been, before Yahweh, the god of the

[1] *Die Personennamen in den Urkunden der Hammurabidynastie* (1902), p. 33.

[2] The companion-name יכין probably comes from יכמן = ירחמ'. Note that two pillars were dedicated to Melḳarth (on this name see p. 46) at Tyre; see Herod. ii. 44.

[3] Dt. xxxiii. 16, reading סיני for MT.'s סנה.

[4] See Dr. C. T. Beke, *Sinai in Arabia* (1878). Independently Gunkel and others have taken the same view (see on Ex. iii. 2). The references to volcanic eruptions have partly been retouched, so that close inspection is needed. Cp. Gressmann's phrase 'stilisiert' (*Eschat.* p. 45).

kĕrūbīm, and, if the text-reading ארון is correct, of the ark. When he led his host to battle he was represented by a material object, probably a stone, if we should not say two stones, not too massive to be carried (see below, p. 35), and supposed to be tenanted by the divinity. This stone was called by the name Aron ('ark'), or rather, in this early period, by some other name, such as Armon or Raʿaman, which can still be detected underneath the corrupt Aron (see p. 34). The stone was probably not carved at all. It came down from a remote antiquity, when, not only between human beings and animals, but between animals and plants, and between plants and stones, the separation was not so manifest as it afterwards became, and when the imperfect Being who was older even than the primitive Yeraḥme'el and the primitive Ashtart could will to reside either in an animal (cp. the *kĕrūbīm*) or in a plant (cp. the sacred trees), or in a stone (cp. Gen. xxviii. 22). Later on, a small rudely carved *kĕrūb* may have replaced the stone in which the invisible God was supposed to be present (see below). (*d*) He was also a god of few sacrifices and simple sanctuaries. Amos (v. 25) may exaggerate when he looks back on the wanderings of Israel as a time without sacrifices. But this god was certainly distinguished by his not requiring the lavish sacrifices which the prophet Amos saw offered at the comparatively spacious temples (*hêkālim*) of the settled Yeraḥme'elites.

Thus there are four titles, among others, which may be given to the older Yeraḥme'el—(*a*) god of the mountains, (*b*) god of storms and of fire, (*c*) god of the sacred stone or stones, and (*d*) god of the few sacrifices and simple sanctuaries. As to (*a*), this phrase occurs in 1 K. xx. 28. It is there used of Yahweh, but he cannot have been the first god to bear the title. Mount Ṣion would never have suggested it (cp. Ps. lxviii. 16 *f.*, lxxviii. 68 *f.*); the phrase must have come from N. Arabia. Among the Phœnicians the Ζεὺς ὄρειος or 'Baal of the mountains' and the 'Baal of Lebanon' (Cooke, p. 54) both most probably have this origin,[1] though

[1] For the second title, see *Crit. Bib.* on 1 K. v. 20, Jer. xxii. 20. The name 'Lebanon' also journeyed to Carthage (see Cooke, p. 127). On the journeyings of Arabian names, see p. 43. As W. R. Smith

the inscriptions containing the latter were found in Cyprus. Such transferences of cults were common. The mountain of greatest sanctity was, of course, Horeb, with which Sinai may rightly be identified. It was originally a mythic mountain which rose into the heaven, but it came to be placed by tradition 'in the recesses of Ishmael'—a distinctively mountainous region. This we gather from Isa. xiv. 13*f.*, where *ṣāphōn* is a dialect form of Ṣibeʿon, *i.e.* 'Ishmael' (cp. p. 50, note 3; p. 80, note 5). The passage is late, but late writers often preserve archaic phrases and conceptions.

Here, therefore, in this simple mountain sanctuary, was the true centre of the Yeraḥme'elite race, for all the tribes originally worshipped the same god Yeraḥme'el or Baal—the Labanites[1] no less than the Yakobites (see Gen. xxxi. 17-xxxii. 1). And though the passage, Isa. xix. 23-25, is probably very late, yet we can at least refer to it in proof of the ancient tradition that Miṣrim[2] and Asshur as well as Israel once worshipped the same God—a tradition which prompted the prophetic hope that in the latter day these three peoples might find a reuniting principle in their common purified religion.

(*Kinship*[(2)], p. 224, note 1) remarks, 'The "mountain Zeus" can hardly be any other god than Eshmun.' Now Eshmun is = Ishmael or Yeraḥme'el.

[1] The Labanites (see on 'Nephilim,' vi. 4) were more tenacious of archaic usages than the Yakobites (note the teraphim, Gen. xxxi. 34, and the 'foreign gods'—represented, perhaps, on Egyptian amulets, Gen. xxxv. 2, 4).

[2] In Exodus the oppressing king is pictured as not 'knowing' Yahweh (cp. Ex. v. 2, 'I know not Yahweh'; viii. 28, 'Yahweh your God'; ix. 13, x. 3, 'Yahweh the God of the Hebrews'; ix. 14, 'that thou mayest know,' etc.). But it is plain that in Joseph's time there was no complete religious severance between the Hebrews and the Miṣrites, and under the 'new king' who 'knew not Joseph' (Ex. i. 8) there were some Miṣrites even among the king's servants who 'feared the word of Yahweh' (ix. 20). Justice will be done to all the facts if we suppose that the change from the earlier to the later Yeraḥme'el was completed in Miṣrim after the supposed period of Joseph's viziership. The Hebrews adhered to the earlier Yeraḥme'el, whom the narrator unhistorically calls Yahweh. But the Miṣrites were certainly Yeraḥme'elites. In Gen. x. 6 Miṣrim is the son of Ḥam, *i.e.* Yarḥam, and in Ps. lxxviii. 51 and elsewhere 'Miṣrim' and 'Ḥam' (Yarḥam) are parallel. So in 2 S. xxiii. 21 'a Miṣrite man' is glossed 'a man of Yeraḥme'el' (מראה is obviously corrupt).

(*b*) That Yahweh was the storm-god and the fire-god could not have been held if Yeraḥme'el had not been so before him. This is confirmed by a passage in the Elijah-story. In 1 K. xviii. 12 (see p. 21) the timid Obadiah imagines that a Being called Ruaḥ-Yahweh will carry Elijah off to some unknown locality. The verb, unexpectedly, is masculine. This suggests the probability that Ruaḥ-Yahweh represents the compound name of a divinity—Obadiah's God, viz. Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh.[1] If this divinity was sometimes traditionally imagined as a mighty eagle (cp. p. 9), we can well understand Obadiah's fear. There were probably Babylonian stories current in Canaan of heroes (*e.g.* Etana) carried aloft by supernatural eagles. The eagle might well represent a storm-god, such as Yeraḥme'el, like the Babylonian-Assyrian god Rammân (from Raḥman = Yeraḥme'el),[2] certainly was. That Yahweh was a fire-god, hardly needs proof. See, however, Judg. xiii. 20, and note the phrase 'the fire of God,' Job i. 16, see also Isa. vi. 4.

As to (*c*), the usual view of critics is that the 'ark' contained two stones, like the two sacred stones (a white and a black) built into the wall of the Ka'ba at Mecca, and representing the deities Al-'Ozzā (a goddess) and Hobal respectively. But a close study of the passages describing the effect produced upon enemies by the ark throws considerable doubt on this theory.[3] When, *e.g.*, the Philistines 'understood that the ark of Yahweh had come into the

[1] *Crit. Bib.* p. 397.

[2] Prof. D. S. Margoliouth (*Religions of Bible Lands*, p. 20) connects Rimmon with Raḥman, 'compassionate.' Rimmon, however, is the same as Ramman; 'compassionate' is only a *Volksetymologie* (see p. 37). Winckler holds that Yahweh is = Addu and Rammân, and that Rammân and Hadad were both brought to Babylonia and Assyria by the second or 'Canaanite' migration (*GI* i. 37, ii. 78; *KAT*, pp. 33, 133). He is therefore more nearly on my side than Zimmern (*KAT*, pp. 444 *f.*). But he does not see that רחמן is but a slight modification of ירחמאל, which is the name of the great N. Arabian god or Baal. A collateral form of Rammân or Raḥmân is רעמן (p. 24), underlying the second word of the phrase עֵץ רַעֲנָן (Dt. xii. 2, etc.), and the second word of the phrases אהל מועד and הר מועד, and perhaps also underlying the divine name ארני (see p. 55). 'Arnon' and 'Araunah' have the same origin.

[3] Cp. Harper, *Amos and Hosea*, Introduction, p. lxxxix.

camp,' they said, 'Elohim has come into the camp,' and asked, 'Who can deliver us from these mighty Elohim' (1 S. iv. 7 *f.*)? It is not the mysterious contents of a chest that they mean, but some divine image or images. Take a parallel case from Phœnicia. The *θεοὶ συστρατευόμενοι*—'fetishes carried along with the army to the field'[1] —were surely visible objects, not anything shut up in a box. Certainly, if *'arōn* could be interpreted as either 'throne' or 'ship,' we could understand the effect produced, for in Assyria statues of the gods were carried about, seated on thrones, and in Babylonia deities were carried in solemn procession in ships, of course in such a way as to be seen. But how can *'arōn* bear either meaning?

Or let us take another passage not relating to Israel's enemies. When the Israelites had been defeated by the men of Ai, Joshua 'rent his clothes, and fell to the earth on his face לפני ארון יהוה' (Josh. vii. 6). Surely the closing words[2] are subversive of the idea that ארון means a fetish or fetishes shut up in a chest. According to Dibelius (*Lade*, p. 32), 'before the *'arōn Yahweh*' means before the Yahweh invisibly enthroned upon the *'arōn*. Certainly, it must somehow mean 'before Yahweh'; but how shall we get this sense? Not by Dibelius' expedient, but by recognising that, like so many other religious terms, *'arōn* has come into existence either by corruption or by alteration, most probably the latter. And just as we have the personal names אמון (Amon) from ארמון (=ירחמ'), and אחר (1 Chr. vii. 12) from אשחר, so most probably we should restore one letter to ארון, and read either ארמון or ראמן (=ירחמאל; see p. 55). In Josh. vii. 6, therefore, the original text was לפני ארמון יהוה, which may be illustrated by *v.* 7, where Joshua addresses his God as אדני יהוה, *i.e.* ארמון י' (see p. 55), and by 1 K. ii. 26, where in the phrase ארון אדני יהוה the two first words are variants representing ארמון.

That the religious authorities of a later age should first of all do away with the stone symbols, and then convert

[1] Ed. Meyer, *E. Bib.*, col. 3749, referring to the treaty between Hannibal and Philip of Macedon. Cp. W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.*(2) p. 37.

[2] That 𝔊 disregards ארון is unimportant.

the word 'Armon or Ra'aman into 'Arōn, is intelligible enough. It was one of the principles which guided them in the practical adjustment of past history and literature to present religious needs, gently to manipulate the inherited forms of expression. This *'ăron Yahweh* took the place of 'Armon-Yahweh, one of the old compound names of the divine duad. Other such compound names are probably 'Armon-ʿAshtar[1] and 'Armon-ʿIbrith (or ʿArbith),[2] underlying 'Aron-hāʿēdūth and 'Aron-habbĕrīth respectively. We may venture to suppose that two sacred stones (perhaps rudely carved) were originally carried in some kind of open shrine on the shoulders (cp. Isa. xlv. 20) of priestly guardians.

I have carefully read what Dibelius has to offer in behalf of his own *religions-geschichtlich* view of the ark in his *Die Lade Jahves* (1906), but there are manifest weaknesses in it such as no archæological learning and tact can overcome. See *Rev. of Theol. and Philos.*, edited by Prof. Menzies, January 1907 (Cheyne); and *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* Heft 4, 1906 (Budde).

As to the *kĕrūbīm*, it is very possible (see above) that in course of time—on the passage of the Israelites into a new social stage—the sacred stones were carved into some rude resemblance to a lion with a human face (cp. on Gen. iii. 24). For the references to the lion in connexion with Yahweh (*e.g.* Hos. v. 14, xi. 10, xiii. 7 *f.*) and with Judah (Gen. xlix. 9) justify the supposition that Yahweh, and therefore also Yeraḥme'el, was (like Nergal) in one of his aspects a lion-god. In the agricultural stage he was naturally represented as a steer-god. But the conceptions of the lion-god and of the eagle-god (see p. 33) are probably older. When I say 'lion-god' I do not, of course, mean that the god was, as it were, bound to the sacred animal, but that in some sense which only a primitive worshipper

[1] Passages like 1 S. iv. 4, 2 S. vi. 2, suggest a close connexion between the *'arōn* (*i.e.* the stone symbolic of 'Armon) and the divine name Yahweh-Ṣebā'oth (*i.e.* *Yahweh-Shemaʿith* = Yahweh-ʿAshtart). This has long ago been observed, but its full significance has not been recognised. For *ʿēduth* see pp. 26 *f.*

[2] Cp. p. 19, note 6. It is possible that in 1 S. iv. 4 ארמון עברית (underneath ארון ברית) and יהוה שמעית (underneath יי צבאות) are alternative readings.

could fully realise, he willed to deposit his divine essence in it.

Passing on to (*d*), enough has been said elsewhere (see p. 63) on the sacrifices. The sanctuaries of the nomadic period must have been very simple.[1] Such temples as those of Shiloh (1 S. i., iii.) were, of course, unknown. The great sanctuary was on Horeb or Sinai. But the whole mountain was sacred; to what purpose would a temple have been?

We now pass on to the later Yeraḥme'el, who cannot be altogether distinguished from Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh. I offer my conclusions with the requisite reserves, but cannot evade the obligation of forming and expressing them. Early in the agricultural period Yeraḥme'el may, like Marduk,[2] have been a god of vegetation. It was he who opened the springs in the mountains, who made the corn to thrive, and filled the trees with sap (cp. Ps. civ. 10, 14, 16). Was he also sometimes regarded as the corn-spirit? Was there a myth in some circles respecting his death and resurrection? It is very possible. The gods Marduk and Adonis would offer a complete parallel. At any rate (as a member of the divine triad), Yeraḥme'el was sometimes pictured as a beautiful young man.[3] I admit that this is inconsistent with other representations. For the later like the earlier Yeraḥme'el was a warrior (cp. Ex. xv. 3, of Yahweh), and may even in some circles have been recognised as the slayer of the dragon. He was also, we need not doubt, the wise Creator of heaven and earth, and speculative thinkers may even have ventured to maintain that he would ultimately renew his creation (cp. the Iranian *frashôkereti*). This idea may, indeed, appear to some to be too advanced, but in its simplest form it is common in the American myths, and is therefore perfectly possible in early Palestine. Nor was even the underworld considered to be exempt from his far-reaching sway (cp. Isa. vii. 11, Am. ix. 2). See further pp. 52*f*.

But his work is not only, nor even primarily, cosmic. To the people at large he is a Na'aman or 'pleasant one,' a

[1] See Marti, *Die Religion des A.T.* pp. 27, 28.
[2] See Hehn, *Hymnen und Gebete an Marduk*, p. 8.
[3] See on Gen. xviii.-xix.

Raḥman or 'compassionate one,' a Dód or 'beloved one.' To their foes, indeed, he sends sicknesses (as Yahweh did to the Miṣrites and the Philistines), but the diseases of his servants he heals (cp. Num. xii. 13, 2 K. xx. 5, Ex. xv. 26, Hos. vi. 1, xiv. 4, Jer. xxx. 17, of Yahweh). He makes their husbandry to prosper; he multiplies their silver and their gold. In return for their lavish sacrifices he makes them victorious in war. He raises up prophets and soothsayers to interpret his purposes, and sages, skilled alike in sacred, speculative, and practical lore. The sacred lore consisted largely in magic, but also in legal traditions; the speculative, in a relatively modest astrology and (as we saw above) eschatology; the practical, in the rules belonging to the arts and manifold appliances of civilisation. We cannot, therefore, say that he is altogether an unprogressive deity. The weakness of his religion lay simply in its incapacity for throwing off archaic and practically harmful elements.

Some of these details will bear elaboration. On the possibility of an Adonis myth I have spoken elsewhere (see pp. 56 *f.*). The great gods had various aspects, and might well be represented sometimes as in full youthful beauty. But the Creator of the world is no Adonis figure, rather the 'ancient of days.' Fear and love may well have contended in the minds of his worshippers, as, indeed, we see in the parallel case of Yahweh. The first step towards creation is the victory over the dragon of chaos, which belongs by right to Yeraḥme'el. The clearest proof of this is, no doubt, a very late one, but late documents often preserve archaic facts. It is in Rev. xii. (mainly Jewish in origin) where we read (*vv.* 7, 8) that 'Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not'; now 'Michael' is a popular or perhaps priestly corruption of Yeraḥme'el (see p. 59), and the tradition is a necessary complement to a parallel tradition of primeval events.

With regard to creatorship I shall refer to two passages. One is Gen. xiv. 19, 22, where the God whom the king of Shalem (*i.e.* Ishmael) and the patriarch Abram recognise as the 'producer of heaven and earth' is called El-Elyōn, 'the Most High Deity.' Now, in the original tradition this

supreme Deity must have been Yeraḥme'el (cp. Gen. xxi. 33, where Abraham calls on the name of Yahweh as El Yeraḥme'el; see *ad loc.*). The other is Prov. viii. 22-31, which deserves a close study, because it proves (1) that Yeraḥme'el was a Creator-God, and (2) that, according to his best worshippers, Creation was the supreme monument of his wisdom. As to (1), it lifts the cultus of Yeraḥme'el to a higher place than we might otherwise give it. And as to (2), it enables us to answer the question, How can it be that a non-ethical deity like Baal or Yeraḥme'el is honoured as the Creator? The non-ethical view of Baal or Yeraḥme'el, so common among the Yeraḥme'elites and Israelites, cannot have been the only one. The wise Creator-God cannot have been tied down, as it were, physically, to a single people; the conditions of his favour must have been moral. It was the inconsistency of 'Baalism' (as Harper calls it) which ruined it for practical purposes.

Let us now turn to Prov. viii. 22-31. It is a monologue of divine Wisdom. Apparently this great attribute is personified, in the style of the Amshaspands (counsellors and assistants of the good God) of Zoroastrianism. Considering, however, that these lofty beings have arisen out of deposed deities,[1] it may be assumed that the Wisdom of Prov. viii. (cp. the Σοφία of the Gnostics) has a similar origin, and that the speaker is really a deity, once worshipped side by side with Yahweh, and afterwards subordinated to him, viz. Yeraḥme'el.[2] The poet, who is himself one of the 'wise men,' evidently has a great reverence for 'Wisdom' (*i.e.* the God Yeraḥme'el), and regards him as possessing a derivative deity. He also considers the special attribute of

[1] Among the Amshaspands there is one who stands supreme (next to Ahura Mazda), viz. Vohûman, who is represented as the first of Ahura's creatures, and who himself produced the light of the world (see p. 11). In this unique position he corresponds to Michael, or, indeed, to 'Wisdom.'

[2] It is less plausible to identify Wisdom with the Zoroastrian Armaiti (the earth-spirit), as proposed by N. Schmidt (*The Prophet of Nazareth*, 1905, p. 45), or with the 'heavenly Wisdom, Mazda-made' of the Yasna (so Cheyne, *Semitic Studies in Memory of A. Kohut*, 1901, p. 112), or, virtually, with Ishtar (Zimmern), who is, indeed, once called 'creator of wisdom' and 'counsellor of the gods,' and who, as Siduri-Sibuti, is called 'goddess of wisdom' (*KAT*, pp. 432, 439).

this secondary god to be wisdom, *i.e.* insight into the varied works of creation. Yet he guards himself against being thought a universalist or 'cosmopolitan'; like Ben Sira (Ecclus. xxiv. 8-12) he makes Wisdom prefer one chosen people as her (his) habitation, and if he places this people in the N. Arabian borderland, it is because this region was endeared by its associations with the patriarchs, and by its reputation as the home of wisdom. Divine Wisdom, he says, was the assessor of the Most High at creation, but in spite of this, no sooner were the N. Arabian lands in existence than Wisdom chose to concentrate her favour on the N. Arabian peoples.

I base this statement on highly probable corrections of the text. It is useless to attempt a mere superficial criticism. The poet has told us that Wisdom is older than the world, and virtually that creation could not have been without her. She is older even than the earliest of the nations, Amalek or Yeraḥme'el,[1] for, as the original text of *v.* 26 says, Wisdom was begotten, or brought into being, 'when He had not yet made the land of Ḥazeroth, and Asshur, and the steppes of Ethbaal.'[2] And now that creation is finished, is Wisdom's occupation gone? No, truly. Henceforth it devolves upon the Creator's assessor,[3] standing before his works, to interpret the creative words. But none of her (his) delights can exceed that which she has in her chosen land of Ishmael and her chosen people of Aram.[4] To sum up. Though the Hebrew poet subordinates Yeraḥme'el (underlying Wisdom) to Yahweh, he nevertheless places him quite apart from men. Yeraḥme'el may, indeed, be represented as only the son of the one independent Deity, but is

[1] Cp. Num. xxiv. 20, and see Cheyne, *Psalms*(2), ii. 75.

[2] ארץ וחצות; read ארץ חצרות. Haṣer, Haṣor, Haṣeroth are common N. Arabian names. ראש, as in Ezek. xxxviii. 2, xxxix. 1, etc., should be אַשֻּׁר, the N. Arabian Asshur. עפרות תבל; read ערבות אתבעל. Ethbaal = Ishmael. Cp. תבל, Gen. x. 2.—Note that קנה in *v.* 22 may mean 'to beget'; see Gen. iv. 1, Dt. xxxii. 6. For נסכתי, *v.* 23, see Ps. cxxxix. 13; חוללתי (*v.* 24), cp. Dt. xxxii. 18.—In *v.* 25 נכבדי מים should be נִבְבֵי יָם (Job xxxviii. 16).

[3] Cp. Wisd. Sol. ix. 4 *a*, 9 *a*.

[4] For the improbable אצלו אמון (cp. Toy), read, perhaps, מֵלִיץ אֲמָרָיו (cp. Job xxxiii. 23). For לפניו בכל־עת read לִפְנֵי מַלְאַכְתָּיו (cp. Ps. lxxiii. 28).

not Marduk represented as the son of Ea? The fact is, that the Wisdom of Prov. viii. is precisely parallel to the 'Mal'ak-Yahweh' of prose narrators (see pp. 58 ff.); he is an honourably deposed deity.

But did it require less wisdom to direct than to create the world? No. Nebuchadrezzar attributes his wisdom, as a ruler, to observance of the way of Marduk and Nabû (*KB* iii. 2, p. 11, etc.), and similarly in 2 S. xiv. 17, 20 the judicial insight of David is compared to that of Mal'ak-Hāĕlōhīm, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh. So, too, the wisdom of the Yeraḥme'elite sages (1 K. v. 10, 11;[1] Baruch, iii. 23)[2] comes from their God. Once more, then, we say that the later Yeraḥme'el was not an unprogressive deity; only, the theological progress of the few did not make up for the stationariness of the many.

It is true we have no specimens of pure Yeraḥme'elite wisdom. The Book of Job, however, professes to represent Arabian wisdom (see *E. Bib.*, 'Job, Book of'), and from the headings in Prov. x. 1, xxx. 1, xxxi. 1, and possibly from the epilogue of Ecclesiastes, we gather that the Yeraḥme'elites were the models of the Israelites in proverbial composition.[3] It is possible, too, that wise priests of

[1] Ḳedem and Maḥol come respectively from Yarḥam and Yeraḥme'el.

[2] Merran = Ra'aman = Yeraḥme'el. Teman = Yithman = Yishmael.

[3] Mishlê Shelômôh (Prov. x. 1) has probably come from Mishlê Yishmael, *i.e.* proverbs in the style of Ishmael (N. Arabia). In Prov. xxx. 1 לאיתיאל ואכל most probably = לאתבעל ואשכל (Ethb. = Ishmael; Ashkal = Asshur-Yeraḥme'el); למואל in xxxi. 1 = ירחמאל. The most obscure part of the epilogue of Ḳoheleth may also perhaps convey a statement respecting the Hebrew proverbs. Eccles. xii. 11 begins thus: 'The sayings of the wise are as goads, as nails firmly driven in.' Then follow a number of words which strike one as suspicious. אספות; how unnatural, without any further hint respecting 'collections'! Then רעה אחד! And why this sudden reference to a disciple (בני)? Read, probably, בעלי פתרוס נתנום בְּנֵי אַשְׁחֻר, 'the citizens of Pathros have given them—the sons of Ashḥur.' One remembers that Balaam, a typical wise man, came from Pethor, or, rather (probably), Pathros, which was not in Egypt, but in N. Arabia (see on x. 14). הזהר, like זרח (xxxvi. 13) and יצהר (Ex. vi. 18), come from אשחר. Then come the glosses. רעה אחר probably = עֲרַב אשחֻר (for אחר see on xxii. 13), *i.e.* 'Ashḥurite Arabia.' הוא ישחר ירחם = ויחר מהמה, where ישחר = אשחר; cp. יתר, 1 Chr. ii. 17 (an Ishmaelite), יתרו, Ex. iii. 1, and יטור, Gen. xxv. 15 (a son of Ishmael).

N. Arabia led the way in the adaptation of the crude mythological stories current among the people, and but for Hos. viii. 12 (see p. 63) we might be inclined to suppose that collections of non-ritual laws were also taken in hand by these sages. Another kind of wisdom—poor enough, doubtless—may be attributed to them. From the story of Ahab and Elijah it appears that the Ṣidonian cult of Baal [Yeraḥme'el] and Asherah required a large number of prophets. Isaiah (ii. 6, corrected text) tells us that the Israelites practised divination in the temples of Rakman (Yeraḥme'el),[1] and the poet of Job (iii. 8) speaks of the 'magicians (lit., cursers) of Yām (*i.e.* Yaman = Yeraḥme'el).' Nor must we forget Balaam, whose god Yahweh was doubtless more fully called Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh; Balaam, as we know, was considered both a poet and a diviner. It would be easy to quote more passages, but I have at least shown it to be highly probable that N. Arabia was the home and centre of prophecy and soothsaying.[2]

Of the medicine of this people we know nothing. Were the 'mastic' (צָרִי) of Gilead and the 'physicians' (Jer. viii. 22) really N. Arabian, as suggested elsewhere (*Crit. Bib.* p. 57)? At any rate, the 'oil of mercy' may have been referred to in their myths (see on the 'tree of life,' Gen. ii. 9), but Paradise, with its magic trees and its streams of wine, milk, and honey (brought from above), was invisible. Yet, still the great though unseen healer was God; honey and balm were always preparing in heaven,[3] whence prayers and spells could bring it. Here, too, of course, Marduk is parallel;[4] also Thrita, the first healer, according to the Avesta (*Vend.* xx.). All these divine healers are also dragon-slayers. It was Yeraḥme'el who slew the dragon, and he, too, who healed the Israelites

[1] Read וּבְהֵיכְלֵי רַכְמָן יְכַשֵּׁפוּ.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Prophetic Literature.'

[3] Cp. *Kalevala*, Rune xv., where the honey-bee flies to high Jumala, and finds the precious remedies:—

> On one side, heart-easing honey,
> On a second, balm of joyance,
> On the third, life-giving balsam.

[4] Marduk, as a healer, drew his wisdom from his father Ea, and made it effectual for those who used the right incantations.

in the wilderness. True, the present text of Num. xxi. 8 refers the ordainment of the healing serpent of bronze to Yahweh. But from the underlying text of 2 K. xviii. 4 we gather that it (or the supernatural serpent whom it represented) had the synonymous designations, Yerahme'el and Ashhur-êthan;[1] it was a magic symbol which brought the divine Healer near his people.

The symbol was characteristically Arabian, but the conception was common to the Arabians and the Phœnicians. The latter had a god of healing called Eshmun (originally Ashman?), who was identified by cultured scribes with Asclepios or Æsculapius.[2] Another name of this deity has been Græcised as Iolaus, one of the names of Punic gods preserved in Polybius.[3] Lagarde, who saw that Iolaus and Eshmun were the same god, on the ground of a statement in Athenæus, proposed to connect the latter with the Arabic *sumâna*, quail.[4] I venture, however, to hold that 'Eshmun' must represent ישמעאל, and 'Iolaus' (cp. Cooke, p. 106) some form either of ירחמ' or of ישמ'; cp. יעל in O.T. The ancients, no doubt, interpreted 'Eshmun' as 'eighth,'[5] there being eight Κάβειροι. But this is no better an explanation than that of Kiryath-arba as 'city of four.' In reality Eshmun must have been the supreme head of the Seven (spoken of by Philo of Byblus), and his name marks him out as originally N. Arabian.[6]

[1] Correct the note in *Crit. Bib.* on 2 K. xviii. 4 accordingly.

[2] See the trilingual inscription, *CIS* i. 143 (Cooke, p. 109), beginning לארן לאשמן מארה, Æscolapio Merre, Ἀσκληπίῳ Μηρρη. מארה is 'enigmatical' (Ed. Meyer, *E. Bib.*, col. 3746). Nöldeke explains 'leader'; Lidzbarski, 'healer'; but these meanings are very questionable. For other theories, see Cooke, *l.c.* The name must be considered with מריחי in *CIS* i. 93 (Cooke, pp. 27 *f.*). G. Hoffmann takes מר to be a diminutive of מלקרת. It is, however, rather to be identified with רם, *i.e.* אֵרֶם, just as בר in proper names often represents רב, *i.e.* עֶבֶר; יחי, like יחו in יחומלך, represents ירחו = ירחמו. Similarly מארה has come, by transposition, from ירחמאל.

[3] In the Greek text of the treaty between Philip of Macedon and the Carthaginians (Polyb., vii. 9, 2-3). Cp. Baethgen, *Beiträge*, p. 46.

[4] *Anmerkungen zur griech. Uebers. der Proverbien*, p. 81; cp. W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.*(2) p. 469.

[5] Baudissin, *Studien*, i. 276.

[6] Cp. the 'Yasumunu' of a cuneiform inscription (*KAT*(3), p. 357),

Few things are historically more interesting than the journeyings of divine names and mythic stories. It is of the former that I would speak especially just now. It is strange how little attention has been given to this point by students of the Phœnician inscriptions. The conclusion at which I have myself arrived is this—that Arabian immigrants very early brought with them names of gods, places, etc., which their descendants in Phœnicia[1] faithfully preserved and used (often in a conventionalised form), even when no longer understood. It is only by acting on this theory that we can give fairly clear and intelligible explanations of many phrases in the inscriptions. This involves using experience gained in the field of the O.T. in restoring the original forms of god-names and place-names. Take, *e.g.*, the famous inscription of Eshmunazar, comparing with it the recently discovered temple-inscription of Bod-ʿAshtart. The name Eshmunazar itself is a combination of Eshmun or Ishmael with the clan-name ʿEzer (see proper names in Ges.-Buhl at end of article עזר),[2] while Bod-ʿAshtart, one of those old misunderstood names, is made up of בד[3] = בר = עֶרֶב (cp. בר in ברולי) and עשתרת, which in the original name designated a region. תבנת, the name of Eshmunazar's father, is the feminine form of תבן = תמן = אתבעל. It may be either the name of a goddess = תנת (Tanith) or of a region. In either case a prefixed עבד has probably been lost;[4] עבד is a conventionalised form of עבר = עֶרֶב. Eshmunazar goes on to state (*l.* 3; cp. *l.* 13), among other things, that he was בן אלמת, and Lagrange makes the feeling comment that 'the deceased does not complain of his own misfortune, it is the grief of the mother which is revealed;[5]

and Samûnu-yatûni, a name on an Assyrian deed (Johns, *Deeds*, iii. 268), conventionalised from Eshmun-êthan. Also ישמון.

[1] One might add Palestine, Syria, and (probably) Mesopotamia.

[2] Note especially ʿEzer, a son of Hur, the first-born of Ephrathah, 1 Chr. iv. 4, and Azrikam, a compound of עזר and יקם = ירקם = רחם, in 1 Chr. iii. 23 (cp. יקמיה).

[3] בד has not always the same origin. In a Piræus inscription (Cooke, p. 94) it seems to be בר = חבר, 'council.'

[4] Cp. ברתנת, *CIS* i. 165 (Cooke, p. 113). So we find מלכו beside עבדמלכו. On 'Tanith,' see p. 45.

[5] *Rel. sém.*(1) p. 406.

i.e. this scholar takes אלמת to be = Ass. *almattu*, 'widow.' Surely it is neither self-pity nor filial sympathy that we have a right to expect here. אלמת is a feminine form of מאל[ירח], just as ישמעאל = עולם (Gen. xxi. 33), and אלמנה = ירחמאלית (1 K. vii. 14, xi. 26); cp. also אש אלם, on a Phœnician seal (Cooke, p. 361), *i.e.* איש ירח', 'a Yeraḥme'elite' (a title of honour). And this gives us the key to the preceding word יתם. Just as אשמניתן and צדקיתן come, respectively from אש'-איתן and צד'-איתן, so the original of יתם is doubtless איתם, where יתן and יתם both represent ערב תמול = ערב ישמעאל (cp. the traditional Belitan = בעל איתן). Similarly, בן מסד is probably to be grouped with בן משך, Gen. xv. 2 (see note), while ימם אזרם probably comes from ימם אדרם, *i.e.* יַמָּן אֵדֶם, and the whole passage (*l.* 3) runs, 'son (native) of Meshek, Yaman-Aram, Etham, son of Me'ēlah.' Eshmunazar's scribe appears to have copied unintelligently some older inscription which claimed for the king that he had the 'bluest blood' in Ṣidon, being of a Yeraḥme'elite stock. The passage is repeated in *l.* 12, with the insertion of נחן (Cooke, 'to be pitied'), which comes from אנחן, 'we'—a scribe's error.

But what of the introductory words נגזלת בל עתי, 'I have been torn away, not in my (due) time'? Can this be right? Surely the context, even as usually interpreted, does not favour this pathetic utterance. Should we not read נגדלת באתבל, 'I showed myself great in Ethbal (Ishmael)'? How the king's greatness appeared is not problematical; he himself boasts (like Nebuchadrezzar) of his temples. First of all, 'Ashtart's house is mentioned. His own mother was a priestess of 'Ashtart (*l.* 15), and bore the name Am-'Ashtart (*l.* 14), which most, since Gesenius, have explained 'handmaid of 'Ashtart' (as if אמתעש'). But אם in compounds most probably comes from either ארם or אלם,[1] just as אב in Hebrew compound names represents עֵרֶב, while 'Ashtart originally stood for a region. And where was 'Ashtart's house built? The answer apparently is (*l.* 16), 'in Ṣidon, the land of the sea,'[2] but the truth

[1] The names אמתעשתרת, אמתאסר (Cooke, pp. 61, 77) probably represent אלמתעש', אלמתאס', where אלמת (a feminine form of מאל = ירחמאל) is probably a regional name. [2] So in Bod-Ashtart, בצדן ים, 'in Ṣidon of Yam[an].'

probably is that ים, as several times in the O.T. (see p. 6, note 3), represents יָמָן; we should render, therefore, 'in Ṣidon of the land of Yaman (Yeraḥme'el).' The passage continues, 'and we made 'Ashtart to dwell שממאדרם,' *i.e.* according to Cooke (after *CIS*), 'there, making (her) glorious.' Elsewhere, however (p. 402), this same scholar, commenting on the שמם רמם of Bod-'Ashtart's inscription, remarks that 'although High-heavens, Glorious-heavens, do not seem very obvious names for terrestrial localities, yet such they probably were.' Mr. Cooke by no means stands alone, and yet such imperfect criticism does not redound to the credit of our epigraphy. That שמם (שמים) in the O.T., and also in the presumed Phœnician text of Philo of Byblus, is one of the corruptions of ישמ', has been seen already; רמם and אדרם ought to have the same origin, or at least the underlying words ought to be equivalent. The probability is that both words come from אֲרָם. Thus we get ישמ' ארם, 'Arammite Ishmael,' one of those phrases which, as we have seen, were carried northward, miswritten, and misunderstood. In Bod-'Ashtart's inscription it is a gloss on the preceding words, בצדן ים, *i.e.* Yam or Yaman is explained as = 'Ishmael-Aram.'

In *l.* 17 the building of a house of Eshmun is referred to. The two letters preceding קדש are almost effaced. The latter may be ד or ר. Most probably we should read שר קדש, 'prince of Ḳadesh,'[1] a phrase which occurs in Bod-'Ashtart (lines 5, 6), and which confirms the view that the god Eshmun (Ashman?) came from N. Arabia.[2] In *l.* 18 we hear of temples for the 'gods of the Ṣidonians in Ṣidon,' including one for 'Ashtart, שם בעל. How is this phrase to be read and rendered? Surely the simplest way is the best (see Cooke's note). 'Ashtart is the 'name' or 'representation' of Baal, as Tanith (Tamnith) is 'the face of Baal,' and Yeraḥme'el (probably) at once the 'name' and the 'face' of Yahweh (cp. p. 21).

[1] Torrey (*Journ. Am. Or. Soc.* xxiv. 217), who admits as a general principle that 'we (?) are all in the dark,' and thinks 'prince of Kadesh' extremely far-fetched; but names of both gods and peoples often are 'far-fetched.' 'Holy prince' is indeed possible, but why this specialisation? 'Ḳadesh' is the name of a district.

[2] This will be so, even if there was a place in Phœnicia called Ḳadesh.

Before proceeding, let me call attention to some obscure names and phrases, of N. Arabian origin, relating to Tyre and Sidon. (1) As to חירם, king of the Ṣidonians (*CIS* i. 5; Cooke, p. 52), it represents אחירם, *i.e.* אשחר ארם, Ashḥur-arām. (2) As to Εἰθώβαλος (Jos. *c. Ap.* i. 18): this should come from ערב־תובל; cp. איזבל (1 K. xvi. 31), from ערב ישמ׳. (3) As to מלקרת (Μελκαθρος, Melḳarth), the Ba'al of Tyre: this was not originally מלך קרת, 'king of the city,' but most probably = אשחרת ירחמ׳. Cp., in O.T., קריות, כרית, etc., and, in Phœnician, קרת in קרתחדשת (Carthage)—all from אשחרת, a feminine form of אשחר. (4) In the Amarna letters, No. 152, Abimilki of Tyre calls himself 'servant of Shalmayâti,' and Tyre 'city of Shalmayâti.' As Erbt (*Die Hebräer*, p. 152) has pointed out,[1] Shalmayâti is = שלמית, the feminine of שלם. But they have not seen that the divine name שלם (*e.g.* in 'Yahweh-shālōm,' Judg. vi. 24) represents ישמעאל, and that שלמית is most probably a title of Ashtart or אשחרת. The names of Tyre and Sidon themselves come from מצור and צדק respectively. See on x. 15.

I venture to hope that the use here made of Phœnician inscriptions, and in particular the identification of the name Eshmun with the name Ishmael, has now been to some extent justified. No student of these inscriptions can refuse fresh light on the poor ground that it issues from an unexpected source.

One of the chief aspects of the God Yeraḥme'el or Ishmael finds expression in the title Dôd, *i.e.* 'beloved,' with which we may compare Isaiah's title for Yahweh—ידידי (Isa. v. 1). The feminine form of this is Dôdah (cp. 'Dido'), which occurs in the inscription of Mesha, *l.* 22. Here the king of Moab says that he took from the Gadite city of 'Aṭaroth (the god) Ar'al-dôdah', *i.e.* the symbol of the compound deity Yeraḥme'el-Dôdah. By Dôdah is most probably meant Ashtart (note that 'Aṭaroth = 'Ashtaroth). The God Dôd was specially worshipped in one of the places called Beer-sheba. This appears from Am. viii. 14, where דרך should be דֹּד,[2] corresponding to the ירחמאל underlying אלהיך,

[1] Developing a hint of Winckler's (*KAT*,[3] pp. 195, 236).

[2] G. Hoffmann and H. Winckler have proposed דֹּרְךָ, but the suffix

and the ישמעאלית underneath אשמת. It is probable, too (as we shall see presently), that דוֹד (Dôd, not David) was the original popular name of the Messiah; also that דוד should be read for דויד in Zech. xii. 8, producing the sense 'and he that is feeble shall be as Dôd,' *i.e.* as the great supernatural Being called Dôd, on which כמלאך יהוה (= 'as Yeraḥme'el Yahweh') may be a gloss.[1] Nor is it probable that these are all the references to Dôd in the O.T. May not דודאים, Gen. xxx. 14 (see note), be derived from דוֹד, and mean 'Dôd's fruits'? The frequent occurrence of דוֹד in Canticles is remarkable; according to Erbt,[2] it is Tamûz-Dôd who is meant. It would not be surprising if the book were based on an earlier poem relative to a Dôd-'Ashtoreth myth. Winckler (*GI* ii. 255) proposes to read דוֹד in another important passage—Isa. xxix. 1, 2—where the points give דָּוִד. But I cannot think that 'Dôd' here is a divine name. There is evidence[3] that דוד is sometimes a regional name, the fuller form of which is אַשְׁדּוֹד, *i.e.* Asshur-Dôd (see p. 23). This is most probably meant here, *i.e.* דוֹד stands for אשדוד; the allusion is to some siege of Jerusalem (here called 'Ariel') by the N. Arabian Ashḥurites (perhaps that of Shishak, king of Miṣrim, not Miṣraim).

The name (= Ass. *dûdu*) apparently means 'beloved.' It should probably be grouped with the reported N. Arabian *Wadd* and *Wudd* and the S. Arabian *Wadd* (ודד = ידיד), *i.e.* the god of love, the Bab. Tamûz.[4] I think, however, that Dôd was also a geographical name, and that as such it is presupposed in the O.T. personal names Dodai, Dodo, Doda-

both here and in אלהיך just before is unnatural. First, the corrupt אלהיך arose; then, on this analogy, דדך was read, whence came דרך.

[1] Erbt (*Die Hebräer*, p. 190) has, independently, made a similar suggestion so far as דויד is concerned.

[2] *Op. cit.* pp. 196 *ff.*

[3] Thus (*a*) in Am. ix. 11, דויד should be סֻכַּת דּוֹד (= אשכלת ד'); the context requires a place-name (see *Hibbert Journal*, July 1905, pp. 828 *f.* (*b*) and (*c*) In Am. vi. 5 כדויד, and in Isa. xxii. 18 בדוד, represent כל-דור, *i.e.* כל-אשרור. In both cases a gloss; in (*b*) on כל-אשור (underneath כלי-שיר), and in (*c*) on ארץ רח' ידים. (*d*) In Jer. iv. 30 the unexplained שָׁדוֹד should be אַשְׁדּוֹד, a marginal gloss on רמה קשת, *i.e.* אֲרַם אשחרת, *v.* 29. (*e*) In Josh. xi. 2, נפות דור probably comes from נפתוח דור.

[4] See Winckler, *Ar.-sem.-or.* pp. 176 *f.*; cp. *GI* ii. 258, but also Hommel, *Gr.* p. 136.

vahu, with which cp. Dûdu[1] in the Amarna letters (44, 45, 52, 151). It is also probable that 'David,' too, indicates that the king of that name was connected with Dôd or Asshur-dôd. One may suspect that Dôd is a popular creation out of Dadda (= Hadad), a name which enters into the compound names which now stand as Bedad, Eldad, Medad, Almodad. For the Assyrian names connected with Dâdu, 'darling,' see Johns, *Assyrian Deeds*, iii. 95.

The name Dôd specially belongs to Yerahme'el, and one of the functions which is most closely connected with it is that of restoring Israel's prosperity. As the shadows deepened on its path the people gave this divine helper an increasing share of its thoughts. Later Jewish writers speak of Michael (a modification of Yerahme'el—see pp. 59 *f.*) when a mighty champion is felt to be needed; but when the popular longing is for just government and an expanded empire the expected hero is either Dôd or some supernatural representative of Dôd, called 'ben-Dôd.' Yes, indeed; the hope of the Messiah as represented in the traditional text of parts of the O.T. is very difficult to comprehend. Who is this 'son of David'? How could a supernatural man—the Messiah—be born as the natural descendant of David? And why need he be so? My limits forbid me to discuss this. For my own part, I hold that the earliest certain literary expression of the Messianic hope is in Ezek. xvii. 22-24, and that before the Exile this hope was cherished by the people, and used by prophets, if at all, only in exceptional circumstances.[2] And I add to this the theory (see p. 57) that what the people longed for was a permanent theophany, *i.e.* the appearance of a God-

[1] Zimmern's hesitation (*KAT*, p. 483) to quote Dûdu seems needless. Dûdu and Yanhamu were both Egyptian officials, but both (as their names suggest) of Semitic origin.

[2] For a near approach to this theory see Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life Before the Exile* (1898), p. 94. Volz, however, had already expressed this view (*Die vorexil. Jahveprophetie und der Messias* (1897), pp. 81 *ff.* Gressmann's tempting hypothesis (*Der Ursprung der Israel.-Jüd. Eschatologie*, 1906, pp. 272-278) seems to me to require some modification. Isa. vii. 14-16 is based on a Messianic prophecy which may be pre-exilic, but the pre-exilic nucleus only extends to יאכל.

man,[1] perhaps of the divine Being called Dôd himself, or perhaps of a man produced by Dôd, as Adapa was produced by Ea. It is true our texts (Ezek. xxxiv. 23 *f.*, xxxvii. 24, Jer. xxx. 9, Hos. iii. 5) speak of 'David,' or (Jer. xxiii. 5, etc.) of a descendant of David, or a son of David; but, like other similar changes, 'David' instead of 'Dôd' may reasonably be set down to the official guardians of Israelite orthodoxy.

It is unfortunate that we know so little of the earlier stages of the popular eschatology. But there is a strong probability that it had its roots in a mythology, the central figure of which was Yeraḥme'el. It is an attractive view that one of Yeraḥme'el's mythological titles was Dôd, and another 'the son of man' (*i.e.* 'the Man'). It was his delight, as we shall see presently, to take human form and visit his people. In primeval times, perhaps, he even died and rose again from death—for whom but for Israel? This, I admit, is only a hypothesis, but it is a plausible one[2] (see p. 57). At any rate, we may venture to assume that the two favourite titles of the divine deliverer were 'the son of Dôd' (*i.e.* of God) and 'the son of man.'

It is not surprising that the latter phrase has had various interpretations. One of the most remarkable is that in Ethiopic Enoch lxxi. 14, where Enoch is addressed as 'the son of man who art born unto righteousness, and righteousness abides over thee, and the righteousness of the Head of Days forsakes thee not.' In the same composite work, lxx. 1, it is said that Enoch, when translated, found the Son of Man already abiding with the Lord of Spirits (cp. xlviii. 1-3). The statements are formally inconsistent, but reconciliation is possible. For Enoch's translation is a vista of the belief that he came from heaven, and the earlier tradition doubtless recognised him, and not Noah, as the first man of the renewed human race after the flood. Worthily, therefore, might he be called the Son of Man. Another such heavenly man, or demi-god, in Babylonian mythology, is Adapa, the

[1] The phrase 'God-man' is not impossible. Winckler (*AOF*, 3rd ser., ii. 299) quotes a cuneiform testimony to it as a title for Ea (iv. R., 17 *a*, 38-42, where *ila amelu*, 'the God-man,' is parallel to *belum*, 'the Lord,' and *bêlu rabû*, 'the great Lord').

[2] For another view see Zimmern, *KAT*,[3] pp. 631 *ff.*; Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, pp. 219-221.

son of the God-man Ea, who actually receives the title *zir amelûti*, 'seed of mankind,'[1] and whom an ingenious scholar[2] even calls 'the archetype of the Johannine Logos.'

Hardly less interesting are the three next names, בעל, מלך, and אדני. First, בעל. Of the important and much misunderstood title בעל שמם (from בעל ישמ׳) I have spoken already. Among the parallels to 'Baal of Ishmael' are—בעל מען, Mesha's inscr., *ll.* 9, 30, Num. xxxii. 38 = בעל ישמ׳; ב׳ חרמין, Judg. iii. 3 = ב׳ ירחמ׳; ב׳ צפן,[3] Ex. xiv. 2, 9 = ב׳ צבעון. The expressions may appear to indicate that the god referred to (Yeraḥme'el or Ashḥur) is the proprietor and inhabitant of a particular place or district.[4] This was doubtless the popular view. Possibly, however, it is a mistake or fiction, and 'Baal' is really an outgrowth of Yarbaʿal (cp. Yerub-baʿal), a shortened and corrupt form of Yeraḥme'el. In connexion with this it may be noticed—(1) that no images of Baal have as yet been found by excavation; and (2) that Addu (= Hadad, also = Raʿaman, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el) appears as an element in personal names where we might have expected Baʿal; while (3) in the Phœnician names we never find Hadad, but only Baʿal. In the O.T., too, we constantly find 'the Baals' spoken of, *i.e.* the local varieties of Yeraḥme'el. In Phœnicia בעל שמם was, apparently, not worshipped before the second century B.C. Previously, the most favoured divine names compounded with Baʿal may have been בעלמלך, ב׳ חמן, ב׳ שלם.[5]

Our next divine name is Melek, Malk, or Milk (מלך).

[1] See *KB* vi. p. 101, and cp. Jensen's note, *ib.* p. 362.

[2] Hommel (*Exp. T.* xiv. 108), who explains Adapad (the fuller form of Adapa) as 'Word of the Father.' Elsewhere this scholar boldly interprets Yampili as = 'the god Yam is the mouth of God.'

[3] *Ṣāphōn* often occurs in O.T. for the N. Arabian region (Ṣaphon = Ṣibeʿon = Ishmael), whence an invasion might be expected. For the Phœnician personal names ברצפן, עברצפן, see Cooke, p. 115. For cuneiform material (including the S. Palestinian place-name Ṣapuna in *Am. Tab.*), see *KAT*(3), p. 879. Of course, such a name might exist wherever N. Arabians had settled (cp. Ṣaphon, Josh. xiii. 27, Judg. xii. 1).

[4] See *E. Bib.*, 'Baal.'

[5] מלך and חמן = ירחמאל. שלם = ישמעאל. Note that in a Phœnician inscription (Cooke, p. 103) Milk-Baʿal and Baʿal-Ḥammān are equivalent. Similarly, in another text (Lagrange, p. 102, note 5) מלך ארן seems parallel to לארן לבעל חמן.

For brevity's sake I refer to Moore's comprehensive article 'Molech' in *E. Bib.* Its theoretical parts may need much modification, but its store of facts is invaluable, and similar praise is due to Lagrange's section on 'Melek' in *Religions sémitiques*, pp. 99-109, and Baudissin's article 'Moloch' in *PRE*(3). The name apparently means 'king,' just as Malkah (see p. 18) appears to mean 'queen.' No doubt the people, and not only the common people (see Isa. vi. 5), so interpreted it. But here, as often, the popular is not the original meaning. Such names as מלכבעל, מלכיתן, מלכעשתרת, מלכרם in the Phœnician inscriptions ought to show this. In none of these cases is the name with which מלך is compounded originally and primarily an appellative. בעל comes from ירבעל; יתן from איתן; עש' is a regional as well as a divine name; רם comes from ארם. There is a strong probability that מלך both as a divine and as a local name[1] comes from ירחמאל; cp. in Phœn. רשף מכל (see above) and in Heb. מלח (in גי מלח) and לחם (in בית לחם), חמול, קמואל, all of which have the same origin.[2] It is true, there is almost a consensus of critics for explaining Abi-melek 'Father (or my Father) is (Divine) King,' though Haupt prefers 'Father of counsel (Abi-milki),' and for interpreting parallel names accordingly, but there is strong reason for holding that אב and אבי in personal names represent ערב, just as אח and אחי (cp. Aḥimelech and Aḥimilki) represent אַשְׁחֹר, while עם may represent ארם. An expanded form of מלך is מלכם, which in 1 K. xi. 5, 33, 2 K. xxiii. 15, is said to have been the name of the god of the Ammonites;[3] we also find it on an Aramæan seal of the fifth century (Cooke, p 561), where, however, it is a man's name. Melek, then, was the name borne by the god Yeraḥme'el, at any rate, in certain circles, and in some of his aspects; Milk-Baʿal, or simply Milk, could in Phœnician inscriptions be used alternatively with Baʿal-ḥammân.[4]

And what did the people mean when they used the

[1] A local name in compounds only (*e.g.* in מלכרם, and in the famous יחומלך).

[2] See below, on Mal'ak Yahweh.

[3] For references in versions see *E. Bib.*, 'Milcom' (Moore).

[4] See p. 50, note 5.

name מלך? Doubtless, king. According to Philo of Byblus the Phœnician god Kronos (= El) reigned veritably upon earth. Later belief must have placed him either in heaven or below the earth. When 'Baʿal-ishmael' became 'Baʿal-shamayim' (see p. 21), we might suppose that the meaning of 'Melek' was similarly transformed. As a fact, however, the sense in which this name was used in the regal period of Israelite history seems to have been 'king of the lower world.' Melek was, in fact, a chthonian deity—like Kronos (El), to whom the Phœnicians offered human sacrifices, and who as an earthly king, according to the old myth, sacrificed his own son in time of calamity. That child-sacrifices were common in pre-Israelitish Caanan we know from the recent excavations at Gezer and Taanak, and the denunciations of the prophets and prohibitions of the legislators prove the prevalence of the horrible rite in Judah in the last half century of the kingdom of Judah. A special place of sacrifice close to Jerusalem is mentioned by Jeremiah—'the valley of the son (or sons) of הנם (Jer. vii. 31 *f.*, xix. 5 *f.*), where הנם has arisen, like המן in Esth. iii. 1, etc., and המון in בעל ה׳, out of חמן, which we have already met with in the divine name בעל-חמן = 'Baʿal Yeraḥme'el.'[1]

If we ask, whence came these child-sacrifices? the answer must be, from N. Arabia.[2] There the cultus of Yeraḥme'el went on without the adaptations and adjustments required by the more enlightened portion of the Israelites. The reactionary section of Israel, however, resorted to child-sacrifices when the state seemed in danger, which was repeatedly the case in the later period. But it was doubtless always in the name of the divine duad, Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh, that the offerings were made (see on Gen. xxii.). Hence it was possible for the legislator to say, 'Thou shalt not give any of thy sons [*gloss*, offering them] to Melek, and shalt not profane the name of thy God' (Lev. xviii. 21). For

[1] Duhm (on Jer. xxxii. 25) is not quite right, but at least approaches the truth. He thinks that the local Baals were brought into a 'mysterious connexion' with Yahweh (as his פנים), and that Melek in the valley of Ben-Hinnom was regarded as a special form of manifestation of Yahweh.

[2] See a hypothesis as to the cause assigned for the departure of the Israelites from Miṣrim (Muṣri in N. Arabia), *E. Bib.*, col. 3789.

Melek, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el, is a part of the full name of Israel's God.

Yeraḥme'el, then, was king, not only of earth and heaven, but of the underworld. Hence that dark side of his worship to which the higher teachers of Israel refer. He became a Semitic Pluto, because he was first of all the god of vegetation. Like Dumuzi and Belili, he was transferred, first of all for a time, and then for a permanence, to the underworld, of which he naturally became the ruler. We may perhaps consider בליעל (= the Bab. Belili,[1] the sister of Dumuzi, and a goddess of the underworld) as Yeraḥme'el's viceroy; בליעל, which *seems* to mean 'no re-ascending,' is really, no doubt, a corruption of ירחמאל, which very early obtained an independent existence, and became a name for She'ol and its ruler. He could also be called מלך, and his consort מלכה. In a Punic inscription we find the names of Ḥawwath, Elath, and Milkath as a triad of infernal deities (Cooke, p. 135), and in the Korán (Sur. xliii. 17) we find an angelic keeper of hell called Mālik.

A strange piece of evolution! That Yarḥam (popularly explained 'the Compassionate') should become the stern king of She'ol is as startling as the cruelty of a Zeus Meilichios.[2] One may suspect that the Babylonian Nergal passed through a similar evolution, for he too was sometimes regarded as a god of the fields.[3] A singular fact about the name needs to be again pointed out.[4] In 2 K. xvii. 30 'Nergal' is the name of the god of the men of Kuth. The passage in its context referred originally to N. Arabian places; Kuth is a fragment of סכות, which comes from אשכלת (see on Gen. xxxiii. 17). Nergal, therefore, may be a modification of Yeraḥme'el; one linking form would be 'Karmel,' and another 'Gomer' (see on Gen. x. 2). The form may perhaps be very old, and have been carried, like Belili, to Babylonia by Arabians. There a native etymology was invented for it (Ne-uru-gal, 'lord of the great dwelling').[5]

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Belial,' § 3. The hypothesis has been borrowed from me by Hommel. For Belili, see the *Descent of Ishtar*, rev. 51.

[2] Miss Jane Harrison (*Prol. Gk. Rel.*) denies the Semitic origin of Μειλίχιος.

[3] *KAT*[(3)], p. 413.

[4] See *Crit. Bib.*, *ad loc.*

[5] Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 476.

At any rate, we know from cuneiform sources that Nergal, under various names, was early worshipped in Canaan.[1] We also know that Nergal's sacred animal was the lion, and it is probable (see p. 35) that Yeraḥme'el too was a lion-god.

To this I must add that there are distinct traces of this deity as (like Nergal) a Pluto in the O.T. In Job xviii. 14 it is said of the wicked rich man that he will have to go למלך בלהות, which is rendered 'to the king of terrors,' *i.e.* Death. Several critics have stumbled at this, and rightly. But what underlies בלהות? Surely בלהו (so it was probably written) is one of the offshoots of ירחמאל, and similarly in Job xxx. 23 כל חי (a weak phrase) should be ירחמאל; the linking form is ירחבל. Death (*i.e.* Deathland) in *a* and 'the horror of meeting of Yeraḥme'el' in *b* are perfect parallels.[2]

Nor is this all. The chief names of the demons (except Satan) come either from Yeraḥme'el or from its equivalent Ishmael. From the former comes Belial or Beliar;[3] from the latter Sammael and [Beel-]zebūb.[4] Most probably, too, the much-tormented word She'ol (שאול) comes from Ishmael (ישמעאל), just as the Bab. *arallu* (cp. אריאל, אראל) most probably comes from Yeraḥme'el (ירחמאל). Also Azazel (p. 30).

Fresh problems for the critic are connected with אדני, Adonai. From the fact that the Septuagint gives Κύριος for יהוה, it is possible that 'Adonai' originally meant 'my lord(s)' or 'lord(s),' as a reverential substitute for 'Yahweh.' In Phœnicia, as most believe, אֲדֹנִי (Ἄδωνις) was a substitute for the real name of the god, worshipped specially at Byblus, who died and rose again. Since Philo Byblius calls the god of Byblus ὕψιστος, עליון,[5] which probably corresponds to אשמן (= בעל שמם), it is conceivable that the true name of Adonis was Eshmun. We know as a fact that myths were current respecting Eshmun and Melḳarth (the Tyrian Herakles) similar to that of Adonis.

[1] Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 415; *E. Bib.*, 'Nergal.' Note too the legend on a seal-cylinder found by Sellin at Ta'annek, '(so and so), servant of Nergal.'

[2] Cp. on Gen. xi. 9.

[3] Cp. Bousset, *Antichrist*, pp. 99-101.

[4] Cp. *Crit. Bib.* on 2 K. i. 3.

[5] Cp. Baudissin, *Studien zur semit. Rel.-gesch.* i. 299 (cp. 36).

Neither view, however, is perfectly natural. Such a compound as אשמנאדני (*CIS* i. 44; Cooke, p. 60) certainly suggests that, if not אדני itself, yet some word out of which אדני has grown is as much a divine name as Eshmun. We have found that seeming appellatives like בעל and מלך really cover over true proper names of gods. Must not this be the case here? And the same remark is suggested by the Hebrew compound proper name אדניהו. It is usual, no doubt, to explain this name as 'Yahweh is lord,' on the analogy of אבימלך, 'Father (or, my Father) is king.' Such explanations, however, are artificial. If יהו be a divine name, so too is אדן; or if יהו be a regional name (see p. 66), so too אדן must be. It should also be noted—(1) that אדני occurs 310 times (227 of these in Ezek.) in MT. in combination with יהוה,[1] (2) that 29 of the instances of אדני in the Psalter occur in the Elohistic psalms, and (3) that late religious syncretists include Adonai in their accumulations of divine names. We ask, therefore, is there any divine name which may underlie the אדני both of the Phœnicians and of the Israelites? And we answer that we cannot point to such a name among the Phœnicians, but that we can among the Israelites. The name among the latter must have been ארמן (Armon or Arman), that same modification of ירחמאל which we have already found underlying מועד in two well-known O.T. phrases (see p. 26), and which, shortened, became רמון (Rimmon) and perhaps ארון ('ark').[2] An alternative for ארמן would be ארנן (see p. 33, note 2); this, written ארנו׳, would easily become אדני, just as ערב in proper names has so often become עבד. The change was at first accidental, being due to errors of scribes or sculptors, but was accepted by the priesthoods. A similar course may have been taken in Phœnicia, but we cannot prove it.

We can now understand how it happens that 'Adonai' sometimes appears where we should expect 'Yahweh,' and how the two words or names are sometimes parallel. See

[1] See Dalman, *Der Gottesname Adonai u. seine Geschichte* (1889); Cheyne, *Origin of Psalter*, pp. 299-303.

[2] The omission of a letter is common. Thus אחר has often come from אשחר, and, a still closer parallel, the royal name אמון, 2 K. xxi. 18, has probably come from ארמון (= ירח׳).

e.g. Isa. iii. 17, Am. vii. 7 *f.*, ix. 1, Ezek. xviii. 28, 29, Ps. xxxviii. 16, lxxxvi. 12, Dan. ix. 3 *f.* and 7 *f.*; also, for אדני יהוה, Gen. xv. 2, 8,[1] Dt. iii. 24, ix. 26, Josh. vii. 7, Judg. vi. 22, xvi. 28, 2 S. vii. 18, etc. (6 times), 1 K. ii. 26, viii. 53, Isa. vii. 7, xxv. 8, xxviii. 16, xl. 10, l. 4-9, etc., Jer. xxxii. 17, xliv. 26, etc., Am. iii. 11, v. 3, and very often in Ezekiel.

We may now return to the question (see pp. 36 *f.*), Had the Israelites and their nearest kinsmen any mythical story of the Adonis type? In Isa. xvii. 10 the phrase 'Naaman-plants'[2] (R.V., 'pleasant plants,' with mg. 'plantings of Adonis') may point to the symbolic κῆποι Ἀδώνιδος, 'gardens of Adonis,' and Erbt would even find a reference to him in Cant. vi. 2 (Canticles being supposed to be based on an Adonis song). Professor Baudissin,[3] too, with all his caution, thinks that Zech. xii. 11 refers to a ceremonial mourning for the death of the god Hadad, 'who was probably combined in some way with Adonis.' For my own part, I take a different view of this passage.[4] But I still hold that אבל יחיד in Am. viii. 10, Jer. vi. 26, and מספד על-היחיד in Zech. xii. 10 may point to a ceremonial lamentation for a dead god (or a dead son of God?), though the true meaning of the phrase may have been forgotten. Hommel's view,[5] that the sacrifice of a lamb in spring-time among the W. Semites is a memorial of the sacrificial death of a god, is bold, but very possibly correct. Then we have the recast story of Isaac in chap. xxii. (see introduction), and I can grant so much as this to Winckler, that there are some few Adonis-elements in the story of Joseph, among which is the mourning so scrupulously related after Joseph's death (cp. on Gen. xxxvii.). I also venture to conjecture that the later Jewish belief in a Messiah ben-Joseph, who was to die by the sword of Gog and Magog,[6] may have

[1] It is reverent to accumulate divine names in addressing the Divinity.

[2] 'Naʿaman' may have been, for the people, an epithet of the dying god. But really it arose out of 'Raʿaman,' one of the many independent forms of Yeraḥme'el.

[3] *Prot. Real-enc.*[3] vii. 295; cp. Zimmern, *KAT*[3], pp. 399, 450.

[4] See *Crit. Bib.*, *ad loc.*

[5] *Exp. Times*, xiv. 109.

[6] See Dalman, *Der leidende und der sterbende Messias*, 1888.

some connexion with an early popular Messianic belief different from what we find in the canonical writings,[1] and which was itself a development of a still earlier myth of the death and resurrection of a divine Being (see p. 36). For must not the Messiah of the people have been a divine Being? Rev. xii. is indeed of late origin, but these late writings constantly preserve fragments of myths of much earlier date. The Messiah, then, was certainly, according to the early myth, the child of the mother-goddess, and very possibly one of his titles was 'son of Dôd,' which translated becomes 'son of God.' He may even have been represented as Dôd himself; cp. the Messianic title 'the Beloved,' Eph. i. 6, Ascens. Isaiæ iii. 17. Whether Isa. liii. is written in the style of a song of the cult of the dying god[2] seems to me more doubtful.

Another name which may have been compounded with Yeraḥme'el and with Ashḥur is Resheph. A god of this name was introduced (from Phœnicia?) into Egypt during the eighteenth dynasty, and, from the dress in which he is represented, he appears to have been in one of his aspects a war-god;[3] his name (see the Heb. lex.) suggests that he may have been also a god of pestilence. In a N. Syrian inscription (Cooke, pp. 159 *ff.*) we find Resheph, or Arku-Resheph (the fuller form, see p. 23), among the great gods of Ya'di, with Hadad, El, Rekūbel (= Yeraḥme'el), and Shamash. Whether these names correspond to as many separate gods may indeed be questioned (see p. 68). One of the qualifying words attached to Resheph in the Phœnician inscriptions is מכל, which, like the divine name מלך, may most easily be derived from יוחמאל; certainly the Greek form Ἀπόλλων Ἀμυκλός = Ἀπ. Ἀμυκλαῖος is an assimilation, not an explanation. Elsewhere we meet with רשף חץ, where חץ denotes certainly not 'arrow' (= flash of lightning, cp. Hab. iii. 11, Ps. lxxvii. 18, and Ἀπ. ἑκατηβόλος), but the regional name חצור (cp. Baʿal-Ḥaṣor, 2 S. xiii. 23). In Egyptian we find attested Rshp Sharamana, in which Resheph is equated with Shalman, *i.e.* Ishmael (cp. שלם in

[1] Cp. N. Schmidt, *The Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 91.
[2] Gressmann, *Urspr. Esch.* pp. 317-327.
[3] For references, see *E. Bib.*, 'Resheph.'

the Phœn. pr. n. יכנ-שלם, and שלמן, a divine name in a Sidonian inscription, Cooke, p. 42). In a legend on a Phœnician seal (Cooke, p. 361), we find 'Melḳarth-Reṣeph,' where Reṣeph, *i.e.* Resheph, is combined with Melḳarth (see p. 46). Once, too, in a Sidonian inscription of Bod-'Ashtart occurs ארץ רשף or אר' רשפם, 'the land of Resheph,' or 'of the Rishpites.' We also find a personal name רשפיתן (Cooke, pp. 60, 74), *i.e.* originally Resheph-Ethan (Ethan, another transferred N. Arabian name). It only remains to be added that רשף was perhaps used as the name of an angel (or degraded deity) placed over pestilence.[1]

It would seem, then, that 'Resheph' was originally a N. Arabian deity, whose cultus was carried to Canaan and Phœnicia, and thence to Egypt. He was closely akin to Yeraḥme'el, who was at once a war-god and a god of pestilence equally with another and a greater kindred deity Yahweh (see Ex. xv. 3, Dt. xxxii. 24, Hab. iii. 5). But, so far as we know, the name Resheph did not take much hold of the Israelites, except perhaps as a place-name or a clan-name,[2] indicating that the place or clan was placed under the protection of the god Resheph-Yeraḥme'el, just as a Sidonian king (see above) speaks of the 'land of Resheph,' and as an Egyptian city was called 'house of Reshpu' (W. M. M., *As. u. Eur.*, p. 311).

Let us now pass on to another important divine name which, though it will come before us again (on xvi. 7), cannot be omitted here. I refer to the name Mal'ak Yahweh (or M.-Hāĕlōhīm). What we have to explain is the fact that the personage so named is not a mere

[1] Gressmann, *op. cit.* p. 85, finds 'Resheph' as the name of a Canaanite god in Ps. lxxvi. 4, but Houtsma's emendation which he adopts (קשת רשף) is a poor one (see Cheyne, *Ps.*[(2)]).

[2] Inferred from 1 Chr. vii. 25 (Resheph, brother of בריעה, *i.e.* ערבי). Cp. also *v.* 16, 'And Maakah, wife of Makir, bore a son, and she called his name Peresh; and his brother's name was Sheresh, and his sons were Ulam and Reḳem.' Ulam and Reḳem being popular corruptions of Ishmael and Yeraḥme'el respectively, we may presume that Peresh and Sheresh also have a N. Arabian origin. 'Sheresh' comes from 'Asshur,' like 'Shemesh' from 'Ishmael.' 'Peresh,' like 'Shepher' in Num. xxxiii. 23 *f.*, seems to have come from 'Resheph.'

messenger of Yahweh, but fully represents the Most High. There is nothing in other Semitic religions exactly parallel, at least if we insist on taking Mal'ak to mean 'messenger.' The explanation of the Palmyrene divine name מלכבל[1] as מלאך בל, 'the messenger or revealer of Bel' (Cooke, p. 269, from Lidzbarski), as if the sun-god (so the Latin of the bilingual Rom. 2) were regarded as the highest aspect of the supreme God Bel, will hardly stand examination. For 'messenger' and 'revealer' are not synonymous. To get the desired sense the name should be שמבל or פנבל. It is almost equally useless to refer to Babylonian. It is true, the principal Gods often have a divine messenger, who is generally an inferior deity, but may be a son (*e.g.* Nabû) or a daughter (*e.g.* Ishtar).[2] But the fact still remains that a messenger cannot be a full representative, and that in any case the name of the divine messenger would have to be added, lest Mal'ak Yahweh should be interpreted to mean 'an angel (messenger) of Yahweh,' which cannot be right.[3] The only possible solution is that underneath מלאך there is the name of one of the great gods worshipped by the Israelites. Can we doubt what that name is? We have seen already that the oldest of Israel's gods was called Yarḥam or Yeraḥme'el, and a further study of the O.T. names will reveal the fact that מיכל, קמואל, אלקום, חילאם, are all corrupt forms of ירחמאל. So also is מלאך, and I would add the conjecture that *malaḫum*, a Canaanitish word for God known to the Babylonians,[4] has the same origin. The name Mal'ak Yahweh thus becomes a designation of the divine duad (see p. 16), either member of which can represent the other. It was natural that at a later time, just as צבאית (a title of 'Ashtart, see p. 20) was changed into צבאות, so the name חמאל[יר], when combined

[1] Note that a Roman inscription on a Tripoli senam (Cowper, *Hill of the Graces*, p. 155) gives the words RRIMO MALLBOLOS, where RRIMO should be = Rimmon.

[2] Zimmern (*KAT*[3], p. 454) also mentions a rare Babylonian word *malâku* for 'messenger, servant.' But this does not help us.

[3] The personage referred to is not a mere angel, but a God, for he is the repository of the 'name' of Yahweh (Ex. xxiii. 21).

[4] Zimmern, *KAT*[3], p. 354. Cp. Sayce, *Exp. Times*, August 1906, p. 499*b*.

with יהוה, became מלאך,[1] and when uncombined assumed the edifying disguise of מיכאל.[2] Into the subsequent history of this honourably degraded deity I need not enter. Evidently he is a parallel to the 'son of man'[3] and the so-called Messiah, partly also to the later Logos.[4] Evidently, too, he absorbed fresh rays of light from Marduk and even in later times from Mithra.[5]

We must not therefore follow Gunkel, who regards the phrase Mal'ak Yahweh as due to a reverential scruple of a later age, and thinks that the original legends spoke naïvely of Yahweh himself as appearing, not 'Yahweh's messenger.' It is rather a sign of the growing tendency towards monotheism, and the increasing repugnance of devout Yahweh-worshippers to elements derived from a lower stage of religion. The higher prophets, as we have seen elsewhere (p. 63), entertained the strongest objection to any display of reverence for Yeraḥme'el, or any borrowing from his cultus. To them might conceivably be due the precepts, 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me' (Ex. xx. 3), and 'According to the practice of the land of Miṣrim,[6] and according to the practice of the land of Canaan, shall ye not do' (Lev. xviii. 3).

Yahweh, then, was the God of the future. Individuals already 'knew' him, but the ideal—'thou shalt know Yahweh' (Hos. ii. 22; cp. vi. 6)—was in the dim distance. For the people of Israel thought to bind their God to them by the tie of ritual, thus, according to Hosea, totally mis-

[1] In Num. xx. 16, however, ירחמאל has become מלאך, and in Ex. xxxii. 34 מלאכי.

[2] The first evidence for the form מיכאל is in Daniel (x. 13, 21; xii. 1). But there is no reason why some devout worshipper of Yahweh, some head priest, should not have produced the name earlier. That Mika'el was well known by name when Dan. x. 13 was written is obvious.

[3] It was N. Schmidt who first pointed out that the manlike Being in Dan. vii. 13 was Mikael.

[4] The Logos has partly grown out of ירחמאל, one of the current corruptions of which is ממרא. Only so can we understand Rev. xix. 12 and the gloss in 13 *b*, viz., 'And he had a name written that no one knew but he himself. . . . And his name is called The Word of God.'

[5] See Cheyne, *Expositor*, April 1906, 'The Archangel Michael.'

[6] Of course, Miṣraim (Egypt) is wrong. Cp. Mic. vi. 16 (see p. 63, note 4).

conceiving the nature of Yahweh, and by each fresh sacrifice adding to their load of sins. Nor is Amos behind his fellow-prophet. 'Come to Bethel,' he cries, 'and transgress' (iv. 4), And again, 'Did ye offer sacrifices to me in the wilderness,[1] O house of Israel?' (v. 25), and 'I hate, I reject your feast-days' (v. 21). Evidently these prophets hold that the nomadic theory of God gave a less incorrect view of religion than that of the far more refined agricultural period. Rather would they see no sacrifices at all than those offered to the God whom his Israelite worshippers called indiscriminately Yeraḥme'el (Baal) and Yahweh, and to the goddess of the many titles (πολυώνυμος) whom *we* know best as 'Ashtart. Alas for Israel's fatal mistake! For Yahweh, and he alone, 'gave her corn, and new wine, and oil, and multiplied unto her silver and gold' (Hos. ii. 10).

Thus, according to these prophets, Yahweh does for his people all that they suppose Yeraḥme'el (Baal) to do, and the return for which he looks is grateful obedience (Am. ii. 9-12, Hos. xi. 1-4). It is quite possible that Yeraḥme'el too had made a similar claim, but if so, the prophets who advanced the claim failed to impress, as Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Micah certainly did impress, at any rate the next age. The probability, however, is that the most progressive prophets of N. Arabia sought a more hopeful field of activity among the Israelites. Circumstances of which we are ignorant—unless, indeed, we accept the traditional account of the Exodus—made the Israelites more susceptible to the higher prophetic teaching than their Yeraḥme'elite kinsmen. The N. Arabian priests sought occupation among

[1] The implied answer is, 'No, not sacrifices, but grateful obedience.' 'Forty years,' as Marti sees, is superfluous, alike for the sense and for the metre. What Marti fails to see is that ארבעים, as often, represents ערבים, and that שנה comes from ישמן = ישמעאל. These words are two independent glosses on מדבר. ומנחה (note sing.) is also an interpolation (Marti). The next verse is an interpolated gloss, 'In fact, ye have carried in procession Sakkith your queen, and Yakman (Ishmael) your god, which ye made for yourselves.' On Sakkith, see p. 18, note 4. יכמן appears as כיון, as יכם (after צלם), and as כוכב. ישמעאל, as elsewhere, has become צלם. 𝔊's *ραιφαν* may represent ירפן = ירמן, *i.e.* ירחמאל, of which יכמן is also a corrupt form. Cp. on יעקב, Gen. xxv. 26.

the Israelites (Isa. ii. 6);[1] why should we hesitate to believe that some of the N. Arabian prophets did so too, especially when we recognise (see below) the real historical relation of Yeraḥme'el to Yahweh? Among these prophets were not impossibly Elijah and Elisha.[2]

The priests, however, were, for the moment, more successful than the prophets. They contributed largely to that distortion of religion of which Amos and Hosea complain.[3] The Yeraḥme'el whom they served was not the god of the nomadic period, nor even the not altogether unprogressive god of the subsequent age, but the Baal of the capital, the god of Ahab and Jezebel. And they found among the Israelites only too much willingness to lend an ear to their dangerous pleadings. Even without their help it was only too easy for those who were disciples of Canaanitish culture to confound Yeraḥme'el or Baal with Yahweh. Hence, on the 'days' or festivals of the Baalim (the local Yeraḥme'els), the Israelite worshippers 'forgot' Yahweh (Hos. ii. 15), *i.e.* forgot that the Yahweh-side of their deity imposed a moral strictness in which the Yeraḥme'el cultus was greatly deficient—forgot, too, that Yahweh had become too great to be worshipped as a calf (or bull), and could no longer worthily be associated with a goddess.

[1] Yahweh has (virtually) forsaken his people, because 'they are full of *kemarim*.' For מקדם read כמרים (a technical term, from רכמנים).

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Prophecy,' §§ 7, 9; also *Crit. Bib.* p. 397, where it is pointed out that אלהיך, preceded by יהוה, in 1 K. xvii. 12, xviii. 10, covers over an original ירחמאל. The biographer of Elijah seems to have distinguished a certain Baal (Baal-shimron?) from 'Yeraḥme'el,' *i.e.* Baal *par excellence*. The less harmful Baal of more conservative worshippers Elijah does not attack. At Ṣarephath (which belonged to the southern Ṣidon) Elijah found religious kinsmen, who revered his own God Yahweh, *i.e.* Yahweh-Yeraḥme'el. Let us also bear in mind the traditions which underlie 1 K. xix. 15 and 2 K. viii. 7 *ff.*, and which represent Elijah and Elisha as closely connected with the King of Aram (the southern Yerahmeel).

[3] Both Amos and Hosea attack image-worship. In Hos. viii. 5, 6, the MT. misrepresents the prophet. Read in *a*, 'I abhor thy calf, O Shimron; | my anger is kindled against it; | to Arabia of Ishmael shall it be brought, | a present to the king of Ashḥur.'—*Gloss*, for Ishmael means Ashḥur; for Ishmael means (*dittograph*). *Interpolation*, A no-God is the calf of Shimron. מישראל and שבבים both represent ישמעאל.

The reader will notice that I am anxious not to be unjust to Baal. That the Yerahme'el cultus had always been morally so meagre is improbable. Hosea himself says (iv. 6) that the priest (priesthood) has '*forgotten* the law of his God.' Some unfavourable impulse—'a spirit of harlotry' (iv. 12)—has led them astray, and through them the Israelites also. The story of the sons of Eli (1 S. ii. 12-17, 22) may illustrate this. Eli and his sons were guardians of the so-called 'ark,' the probable original name[1] of which, and also its traditional connexion with the compound name of the divine duad,[2] suggest that its priestly guardians were ministers of the God Yerahme'el. But according to a tradition which may be not entirely incorrect, the sons of Eli indulged in evil practices like those which Hosea has in view in his controversy with the priests. Eli himself was without reproach; his sons therefore, like Hosea's priests, had '*forgotten* the law of their God,' except, indeed, in matters of sacrificial routine. Now Hosea, like Amos and Isaiah, detests the sacrificial system; he even calls sacrifices 'the sin of Yahweh's people' (iv. 8). The priests, on their side, abhor what Hosea loves, viz. an ethical, non-sacrificial view of religion. The antithesis, therefore, is complete, irreconcilable. The true Yahweh says (Hos. viii. 12):—

> I loathe the temples of Yerahme'el,[3]
> (Where) my laws are accounted as (those of) a stranger.

And in the next verse the prophet continues:—

> They sacrifice the sacrifices of Aḥ'ab,[4]
> Yahweh accepts them not;
> Now will he remember their guilt,
> And punish them for their sin.

---

[1] See p. 34.

[2] See p. 35, note 1.

[3] Read אקוט היכלות ירבעל, and, in *b*, תֹּרֹתַי.

[4] הבהבי probably comes from אחאב, a compound of two short geographical designations, one of which (אח) represents אַשֶּׁחַר, the other (אב) עֲרַב. The same word can be traced in Hos. iii. 1, iv. 17, ix. 10, xi. 4, and Mic. vi. 16. In Mic. *l.c.* we have to read, 'And the statutes of the Arammite are observed, and all the cultus of the house (=territory) of Aḥ'ab.' Is this also the explanation of the royal name Aḥ'ab? Certainly. The far-fetched explanations of this name (W. R. Smith, Ulmer, etc.) are most improbable.

Of the counter-discourses of the priests we have, unfortunately, no record.

I have postponed the consideration of the name יהוה, Yahweh, or (see Sayce and Cowley's edition of the Assuan Aramaic papyri) יהו, Yāhū, in order not to hinder a comparison of the partly similar, partly different conceptions of the two related gods, Yeraḥme'el and Yahweh. The comparison having now been made, it is possible to take up the important question of the origin of 'Yahweh.' It seems to me very hazardous to assume from Gen. xix. 24 that יהוה (יהו) originally meant 'heaven'; and to hold that there were two old monosyllabic divine names Ya and Ho, that *ha-Elohim* is sometimes miswritten for Ho + the gloss Elohim, and that in Gen. ii. and iii. Yahweh-Elohim has a similar origin. This is Hommel's view (*Gr.* pp. 177-179). Still, we can hardly now go back to the old conjectures respecting the divine name Yahweh. So much must already be clear, that the name must stand in some connexion with Yeraḥme'el. I suggest that it may have been originally a dialect-variation of Yaḥameh, which is related to Yarḥamu, precisely as Ḥam (Gen. v. 32, etc.) is related to Yarḥam, and Ḥamath to Raḥamath. We may further venture to compare the regional names Yâmân and Yâmîn, where not only the *r* but the *h* has disappeared, also the personal name Yaḥmai (1 Chr. vii. 2), for which Lucian gives ιαμιν, and the Sabæan name יחמאל. Here, too, I must mention the imagined moon- and sea-god Yâm (see p. 28), the *yâmi* in Aḥiyāmi (Ta'annek inscription, see p. 29, note 1), and the *yâma* which closes some proper names in cuneiform texts of the Persian period[1] (cp. p. 29). It is true that Zimmern and other Assyriologists trace this *yâma* to an original *yahwa*, but obviously *yahwa* (*yahu*) may just as well have come from *Yâma* (*yâm*), which is the short either for Yarḥam or for Yâmân.[2] The evidence is certainly late, but compound proper names, even when recorded late, often

[1] Cp. Johns, article in *Expositor*, October 1903. There are also names beginning with I-am (Hommel, *Gr.* p. 179; cp. p. 130).

[2] Johns (*Deeds*, iii. 414) has found Natânu-yâma several times in Assyrian deeds. 'Natânu' is probably a modification of the N. Arabian name Ethan; 'yâma' ought to be parallel to it.

present very ancient elements. There is also early evidence from proper names that the name Yāū (Yāhū), whether for a region or for a god—most probably for both—was current in Babylonia, both in the age of Ḫammurabi, and, later, in the Kassite period, *i.e.* that it was by no means confined to the land of the Israelites.

A fresh chapter in the history of Yahweh is opened by the Assuan Aramaic papyri. We learn from these that the Jews in Syene and Elephantine in the fifth century B.C. habitually used the divine name Yahu in commercial and legal transactions. 'They swore by the name of Yahu, and a chapel or altar of Yahu stood near the houses of their settlement.' The one God has displaced the divine duad or triad, and the name Yahu holds its ground against both Yahweh and Adonai.[1]

What, then, is the relation of the form Yahweh to Yāū or Yāhū? Probably this. A more original form than either is Yaḥwa or Yaḥu. In a famous Phœnician inscription (v.-iv. cent. B.C.) we find a royal name יחומלך. It is usual to explain this as יְחוּמלך ('let Milk give life'); but should it not rather be יָחוּמלך?[2] Yāḥū or Yaḥwa appears to be a very old shortened form of ירחם; the linking form is ירחו. Out of Yaḥwa (Yāḥū) came Yahwa (Yāhū). The settled Yeraḥme'elites, or rather their priests, probably made this modification, giving it the sense of 'he who causes to be,' 'the producer.'[3] This step may have coincided with a great reconstitution of myths.[4] Yarḥam may, indeed, have been the Creator, but the old creation-myth had probably begun to fade, and its revival called for a virtually new name. From these Yeraḥme'elites the younger Israelite people, under the direction of the priestly tribe of Levi and especially the clan of Mosheh, received the cultus of Yahweh. Previously they had worshipped El Asshur ('El Shaddai') or El Yeraḥme'el ('El-olam'), but on

[1] *Aramaic Papyri discovered at Assuan.* Edited by A. H. Sayce with the assistance of A. E. Cowley (1906), p. 10.

[2] Note that the father of this king is יחרבעל (so *CIS* and Lidzbarski; Cooke, יהרבעל), *i.e.* ירחבעל = ירחמאל.

[3] On the diffusion of the name Yahweh in the south, see Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, p. 378.

[4] Cp. Goldziher, *Hebrew Mythology*, p. 272.

passing into a settled life they accepted a virtually new God. Their traditions unhistorically throw back this event into the nomadic stage.

The date of the original change of Yāḥū into Yāhū must have been very early, if Jensen[1] is right in making the Abd-ḥiba of the Amarna letters equivalent to עבד יהוה, י being often replaced in Assyrian by *ḫ*, and ו by *b*. Johns,[2] too, compares Iba in the name 'Iba-kame, and a French critic suggests that Yabi-sarru in a newly published Amarna tablet may mean 'Yahweh is king.' But I fear we cannot safely lay any stress on such interpretations, and at any rate behind the conventionalised Yabi-sarru a name of different import exists, if we could find it. Among the many similar cases of conventionalised Hebrew names it is enough here to point out that יהו in ישעיהו and similar forms is probably altered from יחו, *i.e.* ירחמו, which is a shortened form of the *geographical* name ירחמאל. Cp. p. 43.

It will now be plain exactly how much truth lies in the statement of Winckler (*GI* ii. 78) that the divine name Yahu, underlying Yahweh, 'is that of the storm-god commonly called by the Canaanite peoples Rammân.' It requires to be added (1) that the intermediate divine name is Yarḥamu or Yaḥu, (2) that Rammân is probably a modification of one of the collateral forms of Yeraḥme'el (Raḥman or Ra'aman), and (3) that all these related Gods are more than mere storm-gods, more than the possessors or controllers of any single natural force, or even of all of them put together: they are divine men—they are personalities.

It is natural to conclude the series of divine names with 'Elohim.' This word is generally rendered 'God' or 'gods'; in the former sense we find *ilâni* (*ilâniya*, 'my gods' = 'my God') in the Amarna letters. But Elohim is admittedly often used in the Hebrew texts, both without and with the article, as if it were a divine name. It is also admitted that an apposition generally stands in the singular, though sometimes in the plural; and that the predicate is generally in the singular, though exceptions (Gen. xx. 13, xxxi. 53, xxxv. 7, Ex. xxxii. 4, 8, 2 S. vii. 23) are not wanting. To illustrate these phenomena,

[1] *KB* vi. 578. [2] *Deeds*, iii. p. xvi.

it has been noticed that the Phœn. אלם may be used with the singular (even feminine) to denote 'god,' like the Heb. אלהים; one may mention (Cooke, p. 99) אלם בעלצדן, אלם הקדיש, אלם אדרת אם, נרגל (of the goddess Isis). It is not so easy to account either for the Hebrew or for the Phœnician phenomena. Let us begin with the latter, having regard to typical passages in the Phœnician inscriptions in which אלם occurs. Prof. G. Hoffmann has already examined these with his accustomed learning,[1] but without fully satisfactory results, owing to his want of a key to the problems. I venture now to build partly on his foundation, hoping that some of my suggestions may be found useful. And, first of all, let me caution the student against trusting appearances. It is true that the names מתנאלם (*CIS* 194, 363) and עבדאלם (7, 334) appear to mean 'gift of God,' 'servant of God.' Experience, however, seems to me to warn us to question these explanations, and to look underneath these names for earlier forms with a non-religious meaning. Then we have in the Maʿsûb inscription, *l.* 2, the strange expression, 'which the אלם, the envoys of Milk-'Ashtart . . . built.' Prof. Hoffmann takes האלם here to be a title ('the divine'), and refers to *CIS* 260-262, 377, where the father is called הרב מקם אלם, and the son מקם אלם alone; also to 227, where the latter phrase occurs in connexion with Suffetes. Hoffmann explains this 'loco divino'; it was an official title doubtless, but suggests the fact that its bearers were great nobles, and claimed descent from the gods. Similarly וכל מרזח אלם means, according to him, 'every one of an honoured princely position.' To these may be added from Cooke (p. 361) the phrase אש אלם, which Prof. Ed. Meyer explains 'divine servant,' but Mr. Cooke, in my opinion more plausibly, 'the nobleman.'

And what is the explanation which will link these passages firmly and naturally together? It is this. אלם in Phœnician, like the same group of letters in Hab. ii. 18 (cp. also in the MT. עולם, אמלל, אמילם, and similar words), is a derivative of ירחמאל; and, in passing, the same origin may be suggested for the Phœn. אלן, 'a god.' Let us apply this to each of the Phœnician passages referred to.

[1] *Ueber einige phönikische Inschriften* (1889), pp. 15-20.

For instance, a genealogy tracing a man's descent to Yeraḥme'elite ancestors was, we may well suppose, a patent of the highest nobility. Eshmunazar, as we know (p. 44), prided himself on his 'blue blood,' and it is highly probable that a Suffete family would do the same. Eshmunazar calls himself בן אלמת, which is not to be read בֵּן אֵלֶּה מֵת (so Hoffm.), nor 'son of a widow,' but (as the preceding description shows) 'son, or native, of Almath' (a regional name, derived from אלם = ירחמאל). In short, the king claimed to be a Yeraḥme'elite, and so, of course, did other high-placed Sidonians. Similarly all the passages can be explained, provided we grant that אלם may, by a natural licence, be also taken as a plural. We may group the plural אלם in the Mas'ûb inscription with the אילים of Ex. xv. 15, Ezek. xvii. 13, 2 K. xxiv. 15 Ḳr., and the אלים of Ezek. xxxii. 21. The אלם in the seal-legend (Cooke, p. 361) is, of course, not a plural, but means 'of high descent,' or, more strictly, 'of Yeraḥme'el.'

Now we can also understand how Phœn. אלם can have come to mean 'god.' The case is parallel to that of *nergallu* for the colossal lions representing the god Nergal, and *ishtaru* and *ishtaritu* for 'goddess.' Strictly, אלם means 'Yeraḥme'el,' but since Yeraḥme'el was an unique Being, and the one or two other Beings in his Company were subordinate to him, his name, in a shortened form, naturally became a term indicating the highest rank in the hierarchy of Essences.[1] It should be noticed that in the Hadad and Panammu inscriptions (Zenjirli), Hadad and El and Rekubel and Shamash are mentioned together. It is possible that El here is but a shortened form of Rekub-el (= Yeraḥme'el), which the stone-cutter—a lover of grand titles—gave as a separate name. Indeed, the probability is that by Hadad and Rekubel the same god is meant. There is an alternative view, but it comes practically to the same thing, viz. that אל has come from יאל, a short symbol (cp. 'Iolaus') for ירחמאל, like יעל for ישמעאל. A similar explanation has already been given of בעל.

[1] Philo of Byblus (*Fragm.*, ii. 18) states that the allies of El or Kronos bore the name Ἐλοείμ, as if Κρόνιοι. אלהים has not been found in Phœnician.

The problem of אלהים now becomes simple. Our experience with the above אלם passages suggests that אלהים must have been produced out of a shortened form of ירחמאל, viz. אלחם ; cp. אברהם from אברחם (xvii. 5), and בית־לחם from בית־ירח׳. We see, too, how אלהים comes to be constructed with a singular verb and a singular adjective, and how the phrase יהוה אלהים was possible. Both in this compound phrase and sometimes when it stands alone (*e.g.* iv. 25), אלהים represents the divine name ירחמאל. Ex. xxii. 19 supplies important evidence of this. For here יחרם is impossible (see p. 29), and plainly represents ירחם (= ירחמאל), an early gloss on אלהים. It may be added that אליל ('idol') has probably the same origin. See *Crit. Bib.* on Isa. ii. 6-22, and cp. Hab. ii. 18, where אלמים (= ירחמאלים) may be a gloss on אלילים. As to אלוה, I agree with Ewald and Baethgen that it is probably an artificial coinage.

We now return to the Priestly Writer's cosmogony, in which he seeks to glorify the weekly Sabbath by placing its origin at the beginning of the world (ii. 2 *f.*). He does not indeed actually name the 'Sabbath,' but it appears evident that he alludes to it as the day of ceasing from work (שבת). Meinhold has made it very probable that the weekly Sabbath is not pre-exilic, that its author was Ezekiel, and that the name Sabbath (which is, of course, pre-exilic) originally had nothing to do with ceasing from work or resting.[1] This scholar thinks that in pre-exilic times it meant 'full-moon day' (like Ass. *šabattum*). I venture, however, to suggest a different view, which in the light of other results appears to me highly plausible. This is, that it meant the feast of Ashtart, who was symbolised as an ear of corn = Aram. שבלתא (*KAT*,[3] p. 428). שבלת, in fact, became שבת, which was originally (as it seems) one of the names of the great Semitic goddess. It is, of course, possible that this name was in course of time altered so as to suggest identification with the Ass. *šabattum*, just as Ṣab'îth was (probably) altered into Ṣebâ'ôth. My own impression, however, is that there was nothing in Babylonia corresponding to the Jewish

[1] See Meinhold, *Sabbat und Woche im A.T.* (1905), and cp. Prof. H. W. Hogg's review in the *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, i. 749 *ff.*

Sabbath. Another suggestion is too obviously right to be rejected. It was the Babylonian and old Oriental principle that things on earth correspond to things in heaven. P accepts this. If God 'rested' on the seventh day, man ought also to rest on that day. The anthropomorphism (cp. Ex. xxxi. 17) harmonises with the view of the gods as extraordinary men, which pervades this cosmogony.

The concluding words, אשר ברא אלהים לעשות (ii. 3), are stylistically impossible. No good Hebrew writer could have appended לעשות, nor can ברא be combined with מלאכה. M. Lambert[1] has already suspected corruption in ברא; the author of 𝔊 also took offence at it, and gives ἤρξατο (הֵחֵל); cp. John v. 17, 'my Father worketh hitherto.' But the corruption is more deep-seated.[2] Probably the last editor of the text had to deal with a title of the following narrative, which he did not understand. The title was אַשֻּׁר עֲרָב, on which there was a marg. gloss אשתר ירחמאל.[3] Both phrases were already corrupt, and by inserting אלהים the writer produced what now stands before us. The text is not improved by the appendix. The two phrases 'Asshur of Arabia' and 'Ashtar of Yeraḥme'el' are of course synonymous. They both mean the region in which the *gan-Eden* was situated, and in which the first men, including Noaḥ, dwelt. Cp. Prov. viii. 26 (pp. 38*f.*).

[1] *Revue des études juives*, janv.-mars 1900.

[2] Schwally (*Archiv f. Rel.-wiss.*, ix., 1906, p. 159) feels the 'monstrosity' of the phrase, but has no suggestion for explaining it.

[3] Probably the document used by P had עשתול, which, like אשתאול, אשתמוע, and אשתמה, came from אשתר ירחמ' = אשתאמל.

PARADISE (GEN. II. 4*b*-III. 24)

HERE we have before us the story of the first man and the first woman, of their happy life in the sacred garden, and of their miserable expulsion from it. The story also includes a myth of the origin of the serpent as we see it to-day, but on this we need not pause long. The early Israelites naturally enough applied the key of the imagination, just as the Finns did (see *Kalevala*, Rune xxvi.). It is Adam and Eve who absorb our interest. The man is produced out of moistened clay (as the myths of Babylon and Egypt—to mention no others—also represent); the woman in a singular fashion, which we will refer to later. We need not suppose that this was the only account of the formation of the human pair current among the Israelites. One possible theory is suggested by the traditional phrase 'Mother Earth';[1] the resources of the imagination are not easily exhausted. We notice too that the first woman receives a name (ii. 23 *b*, iii. 20), while the first man has none. The difficulty is met in iv. 25 and v. 3-5 by omitting the article in *hā-ādām*, so that *ādām* appears as a proper name; 𝔊 and Vg. use 'Adam' in this way more freely. A textual critic, however, is bound to inquire whether an earlier and still discoverable form of the text may not have given the first man a true proper name.

For the present, however, we will acquiesce in the makeshift 'Adam,' and proceed to ask, Have we the story of Adam in its original form? Surely not, is the answer. The story has been altered in order to make it illustrate and explain the facts of ordinary life. It has also received additions, as Stade and Gunkel have partly seen. Elsewhere

[1] Nöldeke, *Archiv f. Rel.-wiss.* viii. 161.

the first man is described as a king and a demi-god.[1] This was the older type of the tradition; we find it in Ezek. xxviii. 12-19 (xxvii. 3, xxviii. 2, 3, Isa. xiv. 13, 14) and Job xv. 7, 8, and in a pale form in Gen. i. 26-28 (cp. Ps. viii. 5). How natural that such a personage should dwell among the magic trees on the mountain of Elohim, and that his beauty and wisdom should be infinite! Symbols of his semi-divine character are the precious stones (see p. 83) which form his vesture,[2] precisely as the Jewish high priest had twelve, and the Babylonian king six precious stones on the breast, indicating the astral connexion of these holy personages.[3] This king, this demi-god, however, was deposed, and not only deposed, but hurled (*v.* 16; see Isa. xiv. 15) down to Sheól, because he said, 'I am Elohim,' 'I am like the Supreme,' *i.e.* because he broke some divine precept, or perhaps conspired against the Supreme.[4] The myth is incomplete. There must once have been more light on the sin of this great Being. That sin can hardly have been partaking of the food of the gods, for how could one dwell on the mountain of Elohim, be robed like Elohim, and be perfect in wisdom and beauty, and not also eat of that food, which, if taken constantly, warded off decay and death, and imparted a happy sense of unlimited power? It is remarkable that in Enoch lxix. 6 the story of the temptation is read in the light of Gen. vi. 1, 2. Of the tree nothing is said, and the tempter is represented as one of the fallen angels.

Let us now turn to the story in Gen. ii. Here (*vv.* 8, 15) we are told that Yahweh-Elohim planted a garden for

[1] We are reminded of the 'fair shepherd Yima' of the Avesta (*Vend.* ii.), the first king and the founder of civilisation, though not the first man like the cognate Vedic hero Yama (see p. 83); also of Maui, 'the Adam of New Zealand.' Of the Bab. Adapa (or, as Fossey, Adamu) I have spoken elsewhere.

[2] See Ezek. xxviii. 13. Cp. the robe of ceremony offered to Adapa by Anu in the Babylonian myth (*KB* vi. 99).

[3] See Zimmern, *KAT*, pp. 624, note 3; 629, note 5; also Gressmann, *Eschatologie*, pp. 108-110.

[4] The passage of Ezekiel closes with a reference appropriate to the king of Miṣṣor in N. Arabia, to whom, by a poetical licence, the old myth is applied. 'Ṣor,' of course, is shortened from Miṣṣor (see p. 46 *f.*). In Ezek. xxviii. 2 בלב ימים probably comes from בָּבֶל יַמִּים, 'Bābel of the Yemanites,' *i.e.* the Arabian Bābel; a gloss. See on x. 10.

the sake of the man. This view is quite different from that of Ezekiel. Thereupon Adam became his gardener. The notion of an agricultural people. Precisely so the legend of Sargon I. (Rogers, *HBA* i. 362) makes the king say, 'My service as a gardener was pleasing unto Ishtar, and I became king.'[1] But Adam's life was not perfect, for he was alone, and Yahweh his Maker (see p. 15) loved society. So God said (according to 𝔊 and Jubilees), 'Let *us* make him a help meet for him,' and then formed out of the ground all the animals, and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them. What is the object of this singular story? Is it merely to prepare the way for the formation of Eve, or to answer some curious questions (such as, How came the animals by their names, or, How came language to exist)?[2] Rather, perhaps, to counteract the shameful vice referred to in Lev. xviii. 23. There may have been stories in existence like that of Ea-bani,[3] or like the tales of the Skidi Pawnee in N. America, in which 'people' are said to marry animals or to become animals (Dorsey, *Traditions of the S.P.* pp. 280 *ff.*). At any rate, the writer declares that none of the animals was fit to be the associate of man, because none was sufficiently like him to be a true helper to him (עזר כנגדו, 'a helper matching him,' as one half of a piece of work matches another).

Observe that some practical object, such as is here suggested, must have been before the narrator's mind. It is probable that *vv.* 19, 20 are a later insertion, suggested by experience. For *v.* 21 fits on to *v.* 18 much better than to *v.* 20, and it is not probable that the insight required for naming the animals should have deserted the man when he had to deal with the serpent, who is represented as one of those very animals on whom the man, in virtue of his superior

[1] Cp. the legend of Abdalonymus of Tyre (Winckler, *AOF* ii. 168).

[2] The narrator assumes that Adam and Eve had an innate capacity of speech.

[3] See Jastrow, *RBA*, pp. 474-480, and his article 'Adam and Eve in Babylonian Literature,' *AJSL* xv. 207-268. Jastrow's theory (that the original form of the story in Gen. ii. represented Adam as having originally had intercourse with the beasts) seems to me highly improbable. The original story represented Adam as a demi-god,—not as an Ea-bani, but as an Adapa.

wisdom and his divinely given authority, had imposed names. One thing, however, the interpolator forgot, viz. that to obtain his object he had to lower the intelligence of the divinity, whom he represents as having made countless experiments—all failures—before he hit upon the right plan. Strange, indeed, it would have been, if the formation of man succeeded at once, but not that of woman. Observe, lastly, that all trace of a theriomorphic Creator (see pp. 7, 9) has vanished.

One may venture, therefore, to hold that the divinity proceeded at once from thought to successful action. Gods, however, do not like to be watched (xix. 26). Hence a deep sleep falls upon Adam, like the sleep of one who is in a trance (Job iv. 13, xxxiii. 15). The God takes one of his ribs and builds it up into a woman. The man is enchanted at the sight, and bursts into rhythmic speech, to which the narrator appends a comment. Why is a woman so irresistibly drawn to a man? It is because of this great event which has permanently determined the relations of the sexes. Observe, the spirit of this passage is in harmony with that of i. 27, 28. It is implied that straightway the man and the woman had a reciprocal longing. *V.* 25 is due to the later editor or compiler, who connected sexual intercourse with a transgression of a divine command.

The story in *vv.* 21, 22 is surely not merely an 'allegory' (Driver). It is told as history, and mythic history it is. It is true, the modern man makes a distinction between mythology and genuine history, but primitive man feels no difficulty in combining facts that are real with facts that are merely divined in accordance with mythological theories. Facts of the latter kind will of course differ in various countries, but there will be an analogy between them, and the fundamental ideas will agree. Thus, in the *Tale of Two Brothers*, the nine gods, making a tour in Egypt, take compassion on a man called Bitiu, because he is alone, and Khnumu (the divine modeller) makes a companion for him who is more perfect than any woman.[1] Here, however, there is nothing like the detail of the rib. Somewhat nearer to

[1] Maspero, *Contes populaires de l Égypte ancienne*, p. 19; cp. Goodwin, *RP* ii. 145.

the Hebrew story is the mythic tradition of the island of Mangaia, which states that the woman at the bottom of the primeval 'cocoa-nut,' being desirous of offspring, plucked a piece of flesh out of her right side, which became Vatea, the father of gods and men.[1] Or take the Malagasy myth that the Creator drew seven women out of the body of the first man, who are the mothers of the seven tribes.[2] The famous Tahitian story, so suspiciously near the story in Gen. ii., has been criticised by Max Müller,[3] but not adequately explained. It is not enough to remark that 'Ivi' (the first woman's name) means 'bone.' The key to the story is probably the fact that at Fakaafo the first man was said to have had his origin in a rock. We must suppose that 'Ivi' originally meant 'rock,' or something analogous.[4] A higher origin is given to the first woman in Hindoo mythology. Dividing his own body into two, Brahmā is said to have become with the half a man, and with the half a woman, and in her to have created (the commentator says, begotten) Virāj.[5] The Iranian story in the *Bundahish* (chap. xv.) is also remarkable. At first the human pair, Matrô and Matrôyâhô, grew up in conjunction with the shape of a plant; afterwards they changed into the shape of man, and, as we shall see, fell into wickedness. They were produced by the seed of a still earlier man, 'brilliant and white,' 'the righteous man,' Gayomard.

Our narrator leaves unsaid that Adam's first care was to tell his wife on what conditions they held their happiness. But evidently she knew from him about the tree in the middle of the garden (iii. 3, 6, 11), the fruit of which, though fruit was their food, they were forbidden to taste. One tree, not two trees; ii. 9, which speaks of 'the tree of life in the midst of the garden,' but also of 'the tree of knowledge of good and evil,' is certainly not in its correct form.[6] What,

[1] Lang, *Myth, Ritual, and Religion*, i. 187.

[2] Campbell, *Travels in South Africa*, 3rd ed., p. 384 (ap. Lüken, *Traditionen*, p. 61). The parallel will become closer if the first man of Gen. ii. was really the supposed ancestor of a particular race of men.

[3] *Science of Religion*, pp. 302-304.

[4] Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vi. 326.

[5] Muir, *Old Sanscrit Texts*, iv. 41.

[6] Matthes (article in *Theol. Tijdschr.* xxiv. pp. 365 *ff.*) and Winckler

then, is the name of the tree? Kuenen[1] and Eerdmans[2] reply, The tree of life; Budde,[3] Holzinger, Barton,[4] The tree of the knowledge of good and evil. A better view seems to be that the tree was indifferently called 'the tree of life' and 'the tree of knowledge (= insight, wisdom).'[5] This identification of life and insight is amply attested,[6] and is in accordance with the best Israelite teaching. He who shares God's wisdom must also share his infinite life. Of course, 'knowledge,' to the writer who inserted 'the tree of knowledge,' consisted largely in ability to use magic arts; it is in the incantations that we find Marduk referred to as 'he that loves to recall to life the dead.' It is true, a later writer took a very different view of the meaning of 'the tree of knowledge.' According to him, the knowledge which the magic fruit conveyed to the human pair was that, in virtue of the sexual relation, they had the godlike power (cp. iv. 1) of producing living beings like themselves. It is plain, however, that this interpretation is not the original one; it is too special. To limit the divine wisdom to the mystery of the reproduction of life is inadmissible; it is also contrary to the partly parallel Babylonian story of Adapa.

The story of Adapa's (or Adamu's) failure to obtain complete divinity need not be retold at length here (see Prof. Jastrow's well-known historical work). The main point of it is that Adapa, the son of Ea (the culture-god of Eridu), was endowed with divine wisdom, but, through a deception practised upon him by his father, forewent immortality. This reminds us forcibly, not only of the infinite wisdom possessed by Ezekiel's first man, but also of the

(*GI* ii. 108) retain the two trees. The latter gives both the same name, viz. 'the tree of the knowledge of good and evil,' and compares the two oracular trees in a παράδεισος resorted to by Alexander in the legend. Certainly the Slav. Enoch (c. 8) speaks of two special trees in the heavenly Paradise—one the tree, sweet of smell, brilliant, and covering everything (the heaven-tree), and the other an oil-distilling olive-tree. The Zoroastrians, too, know the heaven-tree (see Bousset, *Rel. des Judenthums*[(2)], p. 556).

[1] *Theol. Tijdschr.* xviii. 136.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 494 *ff.*

[3] *Die Bibl. Urgeschichte*, pp. 53 *ff.*

[4] *Semitic Origins*, p. 95.

[5] See *E. Bib.*, col. 3579.

[6] See Prov. ii. 2, 3, 6, xxiv. 3, 4, xxx. 3. In Eth. Enoch xxxii. 3, 6, the tabooed tree is called the tree of wisdom.

misrepresentation of the effect of eating the forbidden fruit in the speech ascribed to Yahweh in Gen. ii. 17, iii. 3. For Adapa was actually offered the food and drink of the gods —'bread (food) of life,' 'water of life,' they are called,—but declined them, in obedience to his father, on the false supposition that they were food and drink of death. Similarly, Yahweh-Elohim commanded the man not to eat of a special fruit, because to do this would straightway cause his death (ii. 17, iii. 3). If Adapa (Adamu) had disregarded his father's command, he would have become immortal, *i.e.* he would have experienced such an uplifting of his nature that decay and death would have been for the time impossible, and if he had gone on eating the food and drink of the gods, decay and death would have been for ever averted. Similarly, though in the reverse order, if Adam and Eve had regarded the divine command and abstained from eating the fruit of the magic tree, they would, at however distant a date, have returned to the ground out of which they were taken. The original story doubtless made Adam and Eve take the first step towards an endless life—but only the first step; and this they did at the cost of offending Yahweh.

Can we go behind the narrative and identify the tree of life, or of wisdom? The attempt was made in comparatively early times. The Mandæans said that it was the vine, and Pinches, among modern students, holds the same opinion; in fact, 'wine,' ideographically, according to Pinches and Haupt, means 'drink of life.' It is probable, however, that the vine was not the first fruit-bearing plant which yielded an intoxicant to the Semitic races, and that Enoch xxiv. 4 (cp. xxv. 5) is correct when it says of the tree of life that 'its fruit was like the dates of the palm.' Date-wine was, in fact, always the most used intoxicant in Arabia and in early Babylonia and Assyria.[1] The palm-tree itself was among the specially sacred trees. The conventionalised sacred tree of the monuments is primarily a date-palm, the artificial fecundation of which was a sacred ceremony. In 1 K. vi. 29, Ezek. xli. 18, cherubs and palm-trees are put together in the ornamentation of the temple; and Winckler and Barton plausibly suppose that the palm-tree, which is

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Wine,' § 25.

singularly prolific, symbolised Ishtar, one of whose names, indeed, in Canaan, may have been Tamar.[1]

The qualities of the fruit of the sacred tree remind us of the qualities ascribed to the juice of the soma or haoma plant. It was a magic fruit, and, like Paradise itself, came down from heaven. Just so the Indians and Iranians affirm that the precious healing plants came from the upper world (Darmesteter, *Zend-Avesta*, i. 221). The Indians also relate that an eagle, or the God Indra himself, in eagle form, brought the intoxicating and healing drink from the place where it is kept in heaven; according to Oldenberg, however, the drink was perhaps originally not soma-juice, but honey-mead.[2] The Iranians have a similar tale (*Yasna*, x. 11).

The fruit which Eve partook of, and then gave to Adam, was therefore the equivalent of an intoxicating drink (שֵׁכָר), which the early men, both Semitic and Aryan,[3] naïvely supposed to exhilarate even the gods, and to confer immunity from sickness. An analogous symbol or channel of immortality is the river of the water of life (as Rev. xxii. 1 well expresses it) which watered the garden, and on whose banks grew trees with unfading leaves and undecaying fruit (Ezek. xlvii. 12). The Babylonian sages, too, spoke of a 'purifying oil of the gods,'[4] and later, Jewish and Christian writers of a 'tree of mercy' distilling the 'oil of life';[5] but also of a tree of life (2 Esd. ii. 12) and trees of life (Rev. xxii. 2, virtually). So in the Slavonic Enoch (c. 8), we read of an olive-tree 'always distilling oil.' The belief is, of course, connected with that of supernatural rivers of wine and of oil in the heavenly Paradise. See, further, pp. 41, 84.

[1] Having observed the great part played by transposition of letters in Palestinian names, I would suggest that תמר as a name may have come from רמית. For names of Ashtart still traceable in O.T., see pp. 18-20.

[2] *Die Religion des Veda*, pp. 175-176.

[3] Judg. ix. 13; Rig Veda, ix. 90, 5 (Muir, *Sansc. Texts*, iv. 80).

[4] Hehn, *Hymnen an Marduk*, p. 29.

[5] *Vit. Ad. et Ev.* § 36 (cp. 40); *Apoc. Mos.* § 9. Cp. the rite of anointing the sick with oil (Mk. vi. 13, James v. 14). Indeed, all forms of the anointing of persons as a religious rite may have a similar origin. Neither Vollers (*Arch. f. Rel.-wiss.* viii. 102) nor Spiegelberg (*ib.* ix. 144) has pointed this out. Cp. Slavonic Enoch xxii. 8, 9.

That there is no exact Babylonian parallel to the Paradise-story is well known. The park of magic trees seen by Gilgamesh (*KB* vi. 209), and the kiskanu-tree (palm-tree? oracular tree?) in the sanctuary at Eridu,[1] have no myth attached to them like that of Adam and Eve. And though the Gilgamesh-epic tells us of a magic plant (not in that wondrous park) called 'In old age the man becomes young (again),' the plant is not very prominently mentioned; and though a serpent is introduced, taking the plant away from the bitterly disappointed Gilgamesh,[2] this is only an expression of the irony of fate; there is no trace of any special acuteness on the serpent's part. Quite otherwise runs the story in Gen. iii. A serpent there plays a leading rôle, and his action is dictated by subtlety of intellect. He is evidently no common serpent such as Adam had lately named (ii. 19 *f.*), but either (in accordance with Arabian folklore)[3] a manifestation of the tree-spirit (or tree-demon), or a pale form of the serpent manifestation of a divine culture-bringer like the Babylonian Oannes in Berossus. He speaks, not, like Balaam's ass, because Yahweh 'opened his mouth,' but because he is a supernatural Being.

The object of his conversation with the woman is not altogether clear. He accuses 'Elohim' first of cruelty, and then of deception. Obviously he is not friendly to the great Being. Has he some definite hostile project in view? We cannot tell for certain, because the true sequel of the 'opening of the eyes' in iii. 7 has perished; possibly, too, the first part of the serpent's speech in *v.* 1 is lost, for אף כי, which is not an interrogative phrase,[4] comes in very abruptly. It is possible, however, that the serpent was planning a rebellion against the over-strict divinity. This story, the evidence of which is now not existent, would, of course, be independent of the story of the struggle between the Light-god and the Dragon.

[1] See Jeremias, *ATAO*, p. 99; Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 249; R. C. Thompson, *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*, i. pp. liii. *ff.*

[2] *KB* vi. 253; cp. Zim. *KAT*, pp. 524, 578. There is much mystery about the plant; see Jensen, *KB* vi. 516.

[3] W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.*(2) pp. 133, 442; *E. Bib.*, 'Serpent,' §§ 3, 4.

[4] See Eerdmans, *Theol. Tijdschr.* xxxix. (1905), p. 482.

I am aware that most scholars regard the story in Gen. iii. as a compact whole, but I cannot share this view. In *vv.* 1-7 (part), allowing for the later redaction, the original idea was that for a man to eat of the magic fruit would result (as the serpent rightly affirms) in such a heightening of the vitality as would render him 'ageless and immortal.' 'The divine Soma of the Hindus, the Haoma of the Parsis, and the wine of Bacchus had the same result.'[1] We may also fitly compare the apples in the garden of the Hesperides, and those of Idhun in the Icelandic saga.[2] The passage has, I think, been cut down by later editors, one of whom inserted the description of the serpent as a 'beast of the field' (*v.* 1), and is perhaps responsible for *vv.* 7 (from 'and they knew') to 21, which imply a very different view of the tree. In this passage the tree is no longer that of life, but the producer of a special kind of knowledge—that of the difference of the sexes. 'They became sensible that they were naked, and sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons (girdles).' The meaning is clear. The 'girdle' or 'apron' (I cry a truce to archæology)[3] is the 'garment of shame,' treading on which (according to a non-Biblical saying of Jesus)[4] will be a sign that there is neither male nor female in the coming age.

It is therefore intelligible enough that so much stress is laid in *v.* 16 on the pains of parturition (contrast i. 28). And the question has excusably been raised whether *vv.* 1-7 do not give us a veiled description of the first human physical union and its consequences. Among the advocates of this view are Trumbull,[5] Crawley,[6] and Whatham,[7] who seek to interpret the narrative anthropologically. Crawley,

[1] Crawley, *Tree of Life*, p. 216.

[2] A. Wünsche, *Die Sagen vom Lebensbaum*, etc. (1905), pp. 9-12, 105 *f.*; Worcester, *Genesis*, etc. (1901), p. 208.

[3] I may, however, notice here that in 1696 the men of the Pelew Islands had a leaf-fibre garment round their loins, to which a piece of stuff was attached in front (Foreman, *The Philippine Islands*, p. 39, quoted by Foote, *The Ephod*, p. 43).

[4] See Clem. Alex., *Strom.* iii. 6, 45, and the Oxyrynchus fragments.

[5] *The Threshold Covenant* (1896), pp. 238 *f.*, 258 *f.*

[6] *MR* (*The Mystic Rose*) and *TL* (*The Tree of Life*).

[7] 'The Outward Form of the Original Sin,' *Amer. J. of Relig. Psychology*, Aug. 1905.

e.g., says (*MR* 382 *f.*, *TL* 64), 'There is an unmistakable reference to sexual relations in the story, the serpent being the zoomorphic presentment of virility, which, as has been noticed, is a widely spread way of explaining certain sexual phenomena.' 'The common practice of giving and sharing food as a love-charm may be analogous to the story of Eve and the apple. The result, knowledge of good and evil, receives here a psychological parallel in the primitive theory of the union of the sexes.'

Whatham (p. 273) adopts Crawley's phrase, 'the demon lover,' and holds that 'the serpent's act was prompted, not by ill-will either to Yahweh or to man, but in pursuance of its own selfish lust it became indifferently the enemy of both,' and he quotes the statement of that great temple-builder, Nebuchadrezzar, about the 'serpents that stood erect,' which he set up on the threshold of the gates. He has also a new and somewhat strange interpretation of the divine curse on the serpent and his seed. As for the trees, they are, he thinks, symbolic of conditions or states, and the fig-leaves are symbolic of sex.

To most of this the answer is simple, viz. that the framework of the story being mythical, it is unnatural to spoil the myth by treating its details as symbolic or euphemistic. That the last editor misunderstood the capacities of the tree is willingly admitted. But that he extracted a new meaning from the rest of the passage must be denied. The serpent, to the editor, is as free from lustfulness as the erect (because semi-divine) serpents represented in bronze by Nebuchadrezzar. The fruit of the tree, according to him, was a real fruit; probably he thought of the *dudā'īm* of Gen. xxx. 14, which, as we know, were thought to have aphrodisiac qualities. It is a mistake to trace in Eve's very natural action (*v.* 6, end) a reference to the primitive custom of offering food as a proposal of marriage; it is, of course, in such a case the suitor who offers the food.[1] Nor is it plausible to suppose that 'knowing good and evil' involves an allusion to the dangers of sexual taboo, because this does not suit the preceding words, 'ye shall be as gods.' The phrase is, no doubt, a hard one. Perhaps textual criticism

[1] Crawley, *RM*, p. 378.

may presently assist us in dealing with it. As for the fig-leaves, what evidence is there that the Semitic peoples regarded them as symbols of sex? Trumbull's reference to the two sacred fig-trees of a strange Indian ceremony is useless.

Still it remains true that, according to the later editor, it was not God's will that man and woman should beget children.[1] How came this idea into his head? The lore of sexual taboo does not help us. The idea was produced by the highly archaic notion that God was jealous of his aspiring creature man (cp. iii. 22, vi. 3?, xi. 1-9). A poor and unworthy conception of the Deity, we are tempted to say. The Yahweh of the Paradise-story, and, not least, of the later insertions, is but a somewhat idealised man. True; but let us not forget the development that lies behind. How far removed Yahweh already is from the theriomorphic creators of an earlier stage! How well he understands human nature! An eagle-god, a raven-god, a lion-god would not have been fitted to judge the delinquents as Yahweh-Elohim judges them in iii. 9-19.

I have spoken of the delinquents as if they were all human. I do not forget the serpent. But is not the serpent, as here described, human in three respects—(1) its rationality, (2) its capacity of speech, and (3) its moral responsibility? Even the divine judgment (*vv.* 14 *f.*) presupposes in the serpent something akin to humanity. The serpent-tribe and the man-tribe are indeed separate, but not wholly different, and they have a common consciousness of a primeval tragic event in which their ancestors had a share. This share, it is true, is probably misunderstood by the editor; the original serpent had no 'enmity' to the original man. The phrase 'eating dust,' too, could be used of men as well as of serpents; it is a figure for the deepest humiliation.[2] The woman and the man are also cursed, but the

[1] In the *Book of Adam and Eve* (translated by Malan), p. 12, God says, 'I made thee of the light, and I wished to bring out children of light from thee, and like unto thee.' The conception is that of luminous matter. Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 40, 'celestial bodies.'

[2] *Am. Tablets*, 122, 34-36, 'that our foes may see it, and eat dust'; cp. Mic. vii. 17. Both quoted by Winckler, *AOF* i. 291. Cp. also 'Descent of Ishtar,' *l.* 8, 'where dust is their nourishment' (said of Hades).

curse is mitigated. Reason cannot now be withdrawn from them, nor the solace of mutual help; they will also have a precious drink, which, though not quite ambrosial, nevertheless supports man's heart (Ps. civ. 15). True, all high-flying hopes are dispersed; 'dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return' (*v.* 19 *b*); 'thou takest away their breath, they die; they turn again to dust' (Ps. civ. 29). Observe, no reference is yet made to the vine (see v. 29, J). Observe, too, that death is not here represented as something alien to human nature. Gen. iii., therefore, is not a myth to account for the presence of death. Other peoples have had such myths, among which those of the Skidi Pawnee are conspicuous for interest.[1] But if the Israelites had any such story, it has not come down to us.

We now pass on to *vv.* 20-24. The textual difficulties require special treatment. Suffice it to note here that *v.* 20 and *v.* 21 seem to be no longer in their original context. *Vv.* 22-24, however, connect fairly well with *v.* 7 *a*. Certainty is unattainable, but it would be not unplausible to restore the original text thus, 'And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew all hidden things, and rejoiced. And Yahweh-Elohim said, Truly the man is become as one of us, and now lest he put forth his hand continually, and take of the tree, and live for ever, I will send him forth from the garden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man,' etc. Here the story ends. As we have seen (p. 79), it is very incomplete, and has been much manipulated. Surely the original first man was hurled down to Sheól, there perhaps to reign, like the Yama of the Rig Veda, who, though originally the sun, became the 'first of mortals,' and ruled the underworld, and who is identical with the royal hero of the golden age, the Yima of the Avesta.

Let me now refer more particularly to the subject of 'Paradise.' The Book of Enoch, like Ezekiel, with sure insight, places Paradise on a supernatural mountain. There are, it says, seven mountains, each composed of some beautiful stone, and on the seventh is the throne of God, encircled with fragrant trees, and among them is the tree of

[1] See Dorsey, *Traditions of the Skidi Pawnee* (1904).

life (xviii. 6-8, xxiv.).[1] The seven mountains are evidently suggested by the seven planets, each of which was symbolised by a different metal or colour.[2] We see, therefore, that the Paradise-mountain, like 'that great city, the holy Jerusalem' (Rev. xxi. 10),[3] has come to earth from heaven. It was imagined as of stupendous size (cp. Isa. ii. 2 = Mic. iv. 1, Ezek. xl. 2, Zech. xiv. 10, Rev. xxi. 10); originally, indeed, it was no other than the earth itself.[4] The Iranian belief was similar.[5]

The same result follows from the traditions of the four streams of Paradise in Gen. ii., taken together with the phrase, applied again and again to Canaan, 'flowing with milk and honey' (Ex. iii. 8, Num. xiii. 27, etc.). For this description of Canaan is evidently mythological, and refers to the belief in fountains and streams in the heavenly Paradise which flowed with honey and milk, oil and wine (see p. 41, and cp. 2 Esd. ii. 19, Slav. Enoch viii. 5, Vision of Paul, c. 23). In fact, the four streams originally flowed in heavenly earth,[6] and only when the mountain of the gods was transferred to our earth, would mythological geographers think of deciding what country, whether Havilah, or Cush, or Asshur, or Canaan, was watered by the life-giving streams. See, further, *E. Bib.*, 'Honey,' § 1, note 3; Charles, *Secrets of Enoch*, p. 8; Usener, 'Milch und Honig,' *Rheinisches Museum*, N. F., lvii. 177-195; Zimmern, *KAT*(3), p. 526.

There are, of course, many geographies of Paradise. Wonderland was well known to many peoples; it is enough to mention here the Iranians, the Polynesians, and the Aztecs. The Iranian tree of immortality, called Gaokerena, grew in the mythic sea Vuru-kasha. By drinking of its

[1] Cp. 2 Esd. ii. 19, 'seven mighty mountains, whereupon there grow roses and lilies.'

[2] See Zimmern, *KAT*(3), pp. 616 *f.*

[3] The precious stones, of astral origin, are also mentioned in connexion with the new Jerusalem (Isa. liv. 11 *f.*, Rev. xxi. 19 *f.*).

[4] It was the Babylonian 'mountain of the lands,' which meant originally the earth, and afterwards also the earth within the heavens. Cp. Jastrow, *RBA*, p. 558; Jeremias, *ATAO*, pp. 11, 12, 28.

[5] The Zoroastrian books speak of a heavenly as well as an earthly mountain called Alburz (*Bund.* xx. 1, with West's note).

[6] See above. It was also an Egyptian conception.

juice on the resurrection-day men would become immortal. The heavenly mountain bore the same name as the most famous earthly one, viz. Alburz (*Bund.* xx. 1); from it or from the earthly mountain the rivers of the earth descended. One of the Polynesian Paradises, invisible, but declared to be on a mountain of Raiatea, was called 'the brilliant' and 'the fragrant'; only the highest chiefs could go there.[1] The Aztecs placed their (earthly) Paradise on a spot called Tula, about forty miles north of the present city of Mexico. Tula is now but a mean hamlet at the foot of the Serpent Mount, but once upon a time it was a splendid city, founded and governed by the god Quetzalcoatl ('the feathered serpent') himself. The crops of maize near it never failed. The people had perfect wisdom, and they were not subject to the attacks of disease. The end of this glory came about by a battle of the gods.[2]

The Wonderland of the Hebrews was placed by themselves first in Arabia, and then in Canaan. It may seem strange to ask where Canaan was. Certainly in Joel iv. 18 the mountains and hills which are to flow with milk and sweet wine are presumably those of Palestine, and the '(living) waters,' the 'wine and milk,' spoken of in Isa. lv. 1, are destined for Zion's children. But it is, at any rate, a possible view (see on x. 6) that Canaan, like Miṣrim, was originally in N. Arabia; and even if we suspend our judgment, yet we may reasonably suppose that the S. Palestinian Israelites derived their tales of the primeval world directly or indirectly from Arabia—a theory which does not preclude us from holding that Babylonian influence had made itself strongly felt in these tales. It will be seen presently that Arabian origin is indelibly stamped on the story before us. It is not so much the description given of the serpent, as the account of the four streams (ii. 11-14), which leaves no reasonable doubt on this point. It is true, *vv.* 11-14 form no part of the original story, but if the interpolator understood Paradise to be in Arabia, we may be sure that the earlier writers concerned took the same view. Nor is it superfluous to refer once

[1] Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie*, vi. 299.
[2] Brinton, *Essays of an Americanist*, pp. 85-98.

more to Isa. xiv. 12, 13, where Helal ben Shaḥar (a corruption of Yeraḥme'el ben Ashḥur) is introduced aspiring to sit on the sacred mountain in the recesses of Ṣāphōn. For Ṣāphōn, like Ṣiphion (Gen. xlvi. 16) is a dialectal form of Ṣibeʿon (Gen. xxxvi. 2), *i.e.* Ishmael. As for the rivers and the trees, we may easily grant that in the world's childhood mountain-districts which are now comparatively bare may have been covered with pleasant trees. What are now mere wâdys may then have been rivers. This is postulated by Hommel for E. Arabia. For my own part, however, I would refer to the mythic geography of the Zoroastrian *Bundahish*, and lay no stress on such conjectures.

The river of Paradise is, in fact, the ocean-stream which girdled the earth, and descended from the sky.[1] Cp. Vision of Paul, c. 21, 'The beginning of its (*i.e.* heaven's) foundation was on the river which waters all the earth. And I asked the angel and said, Lord! what is this river of water?' And he said to me, This is Oceanus.' Also the *Book of Adam and Eve*, translated from the Ethiopic by S. C. Malan, bk. i. c. 1, 'On the third day God planted the garden in the east of the earth, on the border of the world eastward, beyond which, towards the sunrising, one finds nothing but water, that encompasses the whole world, and reaches unto the border of heavens.' That this stream parted into four, corresponding to the four quarters of the earth or heaven, may have been an early supposition.[2] Cp. Hommel, *Grundriss*, p. 298, note 1, and *E. Bib.*, 'Paradise,' §§ 8-10; and see Peiser on an old Babylonian map of the world, *ZA* iv. 361-370; Barton, in Worcester's *Genesis*, App. 1; Sayce, *Exp. Times*, Nov. 1900, pp. 68 *ff.* The map represents the world by means of a circle, with the Persian Gulf (*Nâr marrâti*) surrounding it. This gulf was, in fact, regarded 'as a river which flowed from south to north in two different directions . . ., and as being the ocean-deep, was the source from which all the rivers of the earth were derived.' 'Babylon, under its primitive name of Din-Tir, or rather

[1] So, already, Sayce, *Academy*, Oct. 7, 1882, p. 263. Cp. Slav. Enoch, c. 8 (Charles).

[2] Cp. the four angels of the Face in later Judaism; also the four Hades rivers of the Greeks.

Tir-Din, occupies a position near the centre or *omphalos* of the world' (Sayce). We cannot, however, safely assume that Babylon was the *omphalos* of the world to the Israelites, or dispense with the aid of a thorough textual criticism.

Let us now pass on to textual matters. There seem to be many details in the narrative which have not yet been adequately examined. Let us begin with אד (*'ēd*) in *v.* 6, and עדן (*'eden*) in *v.* 8. Friedr. Del. explains אד as a Babylonian loan-word (*edû*, flood). Now if, with Haupt, we may read '*upon* the earth,' and, with Del.[1] and others, take *'eden* (*v.* 8) as = Bab. *edinu*, 'field, plain, desert,' and, with the vast majority, take Perāth and Ḥiddeḳel (*v.* 14) to be the Euphrates and the Tigris, it becomes very plausible to think of Mesopotamia as the home of the first narrators, and we may illustrate[2] by the second Babylonian creation-story (*KB* vi. 1, pp. 38 *ff.*), where it is said that there were no temples, no reeds, no trees, for 'the lands were altogether sea,' till Marduk came in his creative activity.

But can these views of the text be accepted? First, as to אד (only here, and in Job xxxvi. 27). Tradition is not certain, and the rendering 'mist' (see *BDB*) is unsuitable. In Job, *l.c.*, we must read לנאדיו (Houb., Haupt). Here, however, 'stream' is the best sense. Accept it, and *v.* 6 becomes parallel to *v.* 10;[3] at first the earth was dry, but afterwards a stream broke forth (in Eden) which watered the whole neighbouring region, so that grass and trees could grow. The stream is evidently required at this point, for the production of man from moist earth, and for the planting of the trees. But how shall we get this sense? The true reading seems to be יְאֹר; read וְיֹאר עֹלֶה. The reader must, however, not mind the trouble of revising his opinion as to יְאֹר, which probably nowhere means the Nile (see on xli. 1). Here (as in the original Joseph-story) it seems to mean one of the chief N. Arabian streams. Observe that the stream called in Dan. x. 4 Ḥiddeḳel—not the Tigris (see on *v.* 14)

[1] *Paradies* (1881), pp. 79 *f.*; cp. Hommel, *Gr.* p. 245, note 3.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Creation,' § 20; 'Paradise,' § 5.

[3] Holz. suggests that *v.* 6 may once have stood where *vv.* 10-14 now stand; he would make two alterations in the text (see his note). But see *E. Bib.*, 'Paradise,' § 5.

—is called in xii. 5 הִיאֹר (see on xli. 1). For the breaking forth of the stream from underground sources, cp. Job xxxviii. 8, 16.

Next as to גַּן בְּעֵדֶן. According to Del.'s theory (see above), this will mean 'a garden (or, plantation of trees) in the desert,' *i.e.* an oasis. This scholar thinks [1] that by Eden may be meant the part of Mesopotamia from Tekrit on the Tigris and 'Ana on the Euphrates in a southerly direction to the Persian Gulf, and tells us that the nomad tribes which wandered in the pasture-country of that region were called by the Assyrians 'people of the *êdinu*.' This, however, together with all similar views, needs reconsideration. There are grounds for thinking that the benê 'eden in 2 K. xix. 12 (= Isa. xxxviii. 12) are a N. Arabian people, and that in Am. i. 5 Beth-'eden is an N. Arabian locality. Ezekiel's Eden too (xxxi. 9, 16, 18) may very possibly have been in the N. Arabian land called Miṣṣor (see *Crit. Bib.* on these passages, and for Ezekiel, cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Paradise,' § 3). Note also that in Ezra ii. 15 (cp. Neh. vii. 20) we find the benê 'Adin (בני עדין; cp. on 'Dinah,' xxx. 21) mentioned among family names which suggest N. Arabian affinities.[2] This being the case, there is good reason for regarding Eden here too as N. Arabian; and all the more when taking this view enables us to account for the מקדם appended to the above phrase. As the text stands, the word merely gives a vague geographical hint that Eden was somewhere to the east of the country of the writer. But is it credible that the writer could name the region of Eden, but not indicate its position? It so happens that מקדם occurs five times again in the early part of Genesis, and that in three out of the five passages (see on iii. 24, xi. 2, xiii. 11) it gives some trouble to the interpreter; also that קדם in the O.T. is frequently a corruption of רקם, *i.e.* ירחם, a shorter form of 'Yeraḥme'el' (see on xxv. 6). Supposing that there are elsewhere strong indications of a N. Arabian background of the narratives, we cannot avoid tracing underneath the improbable מקדם the highly suitable

[1] *Paradies*, p. 80.

[2] Such as Paḥath-moab = Nephtōah-moab, Elam = Yeraḥme'el, Adonikam = Adon-Yarḥam, Aṭer = Ashtar.

word ירחם. The statement, therefore, is that 'Yahweh Elohim planted a garden (or park) in Eden of Yeraḥme'el.'

To strengthen our position we must now look closely into the text of *vv.* 10-14. Certainly Perāth looks like 'Euphrates,' and the absence of any descriptive supplement suggests that it was, at any rate, the best known of the four streams. Ḥiddeḳel, as Sayce and Driver, Friedrich Delitzsch and Dillmann assert, must be the Tigris. And this being the case, *i.e.* the Perāth and the Ḥiddeḳel being known, we can (it is supposed) start from this fixed point in attempting to localise the Hebrew Paradise. On the other hand, let it be considered that while Perāth may conceivably be the Euphrates, Ḥiddeḳel cannot possibly be the Tigris, (1) because it does not correspond sufficiently to the Bab. name Idiḳlat,[1] and (2) because the descriptive supplement does not suit the course of that river.[2] As to the other two names of streams, no one can imagine for a moment that these names have received an approximately certain explanation. To borrow the words of Driver (*Genesis*, p. 58), 'they elude our grasp.'

An account of the different forms of the Babylonian theory will be found in *E. Bib.*, 'Paradise,' § 8. They all seem to presuppose that the geography of the writer was of the most 'childish' description. To accept any of them involves the assumption that, according to the narrator, the Euphrates and the Tigris come from the same principal stream, and that S. Arabia and Nubia are physically connected, the whole of the southern part of the earth being 'a continuous territory stretching from utmost Nubia (Ethiopia) through S. Arabia to India.'[3] Surely we ought to hesitate before, without a sufficiently keen textual criticism, we impute such wild imaginations to the sober-minded Hebrew narrator.

Textual criticism, then, must be called in. Only, it must be a methodical criticism, one that takes account of recurrent types of corruption, and in applying it we must not refuse

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Ḥiddeḳel' (Johns). Hommel (*AHT*, p. 315; cp. *Aufsätze*, iii. 1, p. 281) thinks that the first element in חדקל must be the Ar. *ḥadd*, *i.e.* wady. Cannot something better be produced?

[2] The theory of Sayce and Gunkel is referred to later.

[3] So Winckler (*E. Bib.*, 'Sinai,' § 7; *KAT*[3], p. 137), followed by Gunkel (*Genesis*[2], p. 7).

to be guided by the only geographical theory which remains to be tried—the N. Arabian.[1] Now it so happens that again and again in the O.T. (still, of course, assuming this theory to be in the main correct) we find ארבע 'four' mis-written for עֵרֶב 'Arabia' (see on vii. 4, xv. 13, xxiii. 2), and ראש for אַשֻּׁר (see on xlvi. 21). Accepting the correction suggested by these parallels, we get the statement that 'a river proceeds from Eden to water the garden, and from thence it parts itself and belongs to Arabia of the Asshurites.' If these two corrections (in *v.* 8 and *v.* 10) be accepted, we no longer have to assume that the creation and the deluge stories (for these certainly go together) have different affinities from the rest of the early legends. Also we are now relieved from the improbable and unintelligible phrase 'four heads.'[2] But is 'Arabia of the Asshurites' the only correction needed? Certainly not. ומשם יפרד ('and from thence it parted' or 'spread') is almost as improbable as ארבעה ראשים. Now it so happens that שם and משם have often come from ישמעאל (see *e.g.* Hos. ii. 17, Isa. lii. 11), and that עפר and ארף sometimes (see on x. 22, and on xvi. 12) represent an original ערב; also that היה sometimes represents הוא—the הוא which introduces glosses. I am, for my part, unaware of any explanation of this otherwise hopeless passage so defensible and therefore so probable as this, viz. that only the first half of the verse is genuine, the rest having been constructed by the redactor out of the two glosses—'that is, Ishmael-ʿarāb,' and 'that is, with reference to Arab-aššūrīm.' These glosses should of course go into the margin. They are not, however, to be despised, for they state emphatically that the garden of Eden is situated in Arabian Ishmael, otherwise called Arabia of the Asshurites. Where this lay exactly, we are not called upon to say; ancient Arabian geography cannot be manufactured to order. Note, however, that 'Asshurim' occurs again

[1] For the main facts which underlie this theory, see Winckler, *KAT*[(3)], pp. 144 *f.*, and *Hibbert Journal*, April 1904, pp. 571-590; Cheyne, *E. Bib.*, iii. (1902), cols. 3163 *ff.*; *Bible Problems* (1904), pp. 164 *ff.*

[2] It is not legitimate to render ראשים 'beginnings of streams' or (as König) 'masses,' and to paraphrase 'arms.' The right meaning 'sources' being unsuitable here, the word must be corrupt.

in xxv. 3 and 'Asshur' in *v.* 11 (see note) as the name of a N. Arabian region. It should be the same district which is referred to in xiii. 10 (see note).

Hommel's view (*Aufsätze*, p. 333) that the *nāhār*, or 'river,' of *v.* 10 is the Bab. *Nâr marrâti*,[1] goes together with his location of the four 'streams of Eden' in E. Arabia, all of which, according to him, flowed into the (ancient) Persian Gulf.[2] From our present point of view, however, there were, according to the earlier story, not four streams, but one, the exact position of which I will not attempt to determine. At the same time, I do not deny that the corruption ארבʼ ראשים, 'four heads,' may have been helped by a floating belief that Paradise was watered by four streams—a belief which may indeed have been primitive.[3]

It is a consequence of the foregoing conclusion that *vv.* 11-14 are an interpolation. This passage implies the view that there were four streams of Paradise, which the interpolator endeavours to name. It is, however, a *crux interpretum*, and is manifestly corrupt. Can we, by a methodical criticism, approximately restore the original text?

With regard to the fourth name, it is not *necessarily* 'Euphrates' (Bab. Purattu). A study of Jer. xiii. 1-7 reveals the fact that there was a פְּרָת much nearer to Jerusalem than the Euphrates. A N. Arabian stream may well have been called by this name, which can easily have arisen out of אפרת.[4] This view becomes more than a mere fancy when we find that it is applicable on a large scale,[5] by no means to the disadvantage of exegesis. Another name of the נהר פרת (as it is generally called) seems to have been הנהר הגדול, or, as the underlying text may

[1] *I.e.* the modern *Shatt el-ʿArab*, 'which, anciently, was much broader than it is now.' Note that Schrader (*KAT*[(2)], p. 423) and Sayce (*Exp. Times*, Nov. 1906, p. 72) venture to find *nâr marrâti* underlying the מְרָתַיִם of the MT. of Jer. l. 21.

[2] See *Vier neue arab. Landschaftsnamen im A.T. nebst einem Nachtrag*, etc., in *Aufsätze und Abhandl.* pp. 273-343, and cp. *AHT*, pp. 314 *ff.*

[3] See p. 86.

[4] Ephrath or Ephrathah is the wife of Caleb and the mother of Ḥūr or Ashḥūr (1 Chr. ii. 19, 50).

[5] The single passage in which it is perhaps easiest to interpret פרת as 'Euphrates' is Jer. li. 63.

perhaps have run, נְהַר גִּלְעָד (see on xv. 18, Dt. i. 7). The third river, חִדֶּקֶל, is no doubt to be combined with דקלה (x. 27), which name does not mean 'a palm-tree' (so *e.g.* Hommel), but is a popular corruption of a compound name, viz. either אֹשְׁחֶר ירח׳ or חדד ירח׳ (cp. xxv. 15). So too is חדקל. A similar form is חדרך (Zech. ix. 1). Ḥiddeḳel is here said to flow קדמת אשור, 'east of Asshur.' But this does not suit the Tigris. Winckler thèrefore (*AOF*, 3rd ser., ii. 314) boldly explains 'south,' while Gunkel thinks the Hebrew writer may have known of the city called Ashur, which was the earliest capital of Assyria, and lay west of the Tigris. Attempts to get over קדמת having proved a failure,[1] we must apply the Arabian key. If 'Asshur' is the name of an Arabian region not far from 'Miṣrim' (see on Josh. xiii. 3), the statement in ii. 14 *a* may possibly enough be correct. On Ḥiddeḳel, see, further, on xli. 1, and on the Arabian 'Asshur,' p. 23, and on x. 22.

The second river-name (גיחון) is not so easily explained. The latest guess—that it means the Leontes—is a curiosity.[2] We know, however, of a son of Gad named חַגִּי (xlvi. 16); the name is coupled with צפיון, *i.e.* צבעון, a form of ישמעאל. Probably גיחון should be חגיון; the stream may have bounded the territory of Gad in the Ṣibeʿonite border-land. Cp. also חַגִּי, חַגִּיָּה, חַגִּית. Remember that the writer *had to produce* four names. A geographical gloss is appended—'that is it which encircles the whole land of Kūsh'—again a N. Arabian region[3] (see on 'Kūsh,' x. 6). The first name (פישון) is to be similarly explained;[4] transpose letters and read ישפון = ישפן, the name of a son of Shashaḳ, *i.e.* Ashḥur (1 Chr. viii. 22). Like נפשי (Num. xxiii. 10, Judg. v. 21, etc.), ישפן is a corruption of ישבן (cp. שבניה, שבנא) = ישמן = ישמעאל.[5] The gloss is, 'that is it which encircles the whole

[1] See *E. Bib.*, col. 3573, note 1.

[2] Van Doorninck (*Th. T.*, May 1905, p. 236). The Pishon becomes the Leontes. Havîlah and Kūsh are substitutes for unknown or less familiar names.

[3] The Babylonian Kash (Schrader, Sayce, Ed. Meyer?) is certainly not intended. Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Cush.'

[4] The current explanations of Pishon, not excluding Paul Haupt's (see *E. Bib.*, 'Paradise,' § 8; 'Pishon'), are extremely improbable.

[5] Cp. צפון (Isa. xiv. 13, Jer. i. 14, etc) = צבעון = ישמעאל.

land of ha-Ḥavîlah.' Now Ḥavîlah (elsewhere without the article, and so Sam. here) is certainly a popular corruption of Ḥamîlah, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el (see on x. 7).

Then follows in MT. and 𝔊 a notice of the presence in that land of gold, and of *bedōlaḥ* and the *shōham*-stone, and between the references to gold and to the other two products there is a naïvely enthusiastic statement that 'the gold of that land is good.' These notices are unique in this little section; the definition of a land by its natural products rather than by its geographical position, or by the other names given to it, or by places within it, is surprising. Besides this, to refer, in illustration, to *bedolaḥ* and the *shōham*-stone is to carry darkness where once it was, comparatively speaking, light. 'Ḥavîlah' was apparently a well-known region (see xxv. 18, 1 S. xv. 7, and cp. Gen. x. 7, 29; there is no occasion to suppose two 'Ḥavîlahs' to be referred to here); the vague statement 'where there is gold,' etc., is, on this ground, too, highly improbable. Consequently there is the strongest reason for criticising the text. First as to the clause containing בדלח and שהם (אבן השהם).[1] The former word occurs again only in Num. xi. 7, where it is corrupt; the latter occurs again and again as the name of a much-esteemed precious stone. There is no reason, however, why שהם, not less than בדלח, should not be a corruption of an ethnic or place-name, for precious stones were not unfrequently named with reference to the country where they were abundant.[2] In 1 Chr. xxiv. 27 it certainly is a corrupt ethnic, as the names close by שהם show; cp. חמשים from רמשחים (see on Ex. xiii. 18). We may assume that here too it is so, *i.e.* that ש׳ = רמשח, *i.e.* Aram-Ashḥur. בדלח now reveals its secret. It represents עֲרַב ירחמאל, and is ‖ to חדקל (see above) and to בדקר (2 K. ix. 25) = ערב רקם, 'Reḳemite (Yeraḥme'elite) Arabia.' אבן also needs correction. In xlix. 24 the word comes from אַבִּר;

[1] Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Onyx,' 'Topaz,' 'Gold,' § 1 *b*. Peiser (*ZATW*, 1897, pp. 347 *f.*) identifies בדלח with Bab. *bid-li-í*, in Babylonian contracts for a minor product of Babylonian husbandry—some kind of spice. (חוילה he takes to be a portion of Babylonia surrounded by the river פישון). G. B. Gray adopts this for Num. xi. 7, but unsuitably.

[2] Thus אֶבֶן תַּרְשִׁישׁ = אֶבֶן אַשְׁתַּר; אֹדֶם = אֱדֹם; כַּרְכֹּד = רקם (ירחמ׳).

here, from עֵרֶב. Thus we get for *v.* 12 *b* (reserving שם), עֵרֶב ירחמ׳ עֵרֶב ישמ׳, two readings combined. Next, as to the two clauses respecting the gold. זהב is one of a group of words (including שבא, ציבא, צבעים, צבעון) which are ultimately traceable to ישמעאל; see on xxxvi. 39, Dt. i. 1. 'Where there is gold,' etc., being unsatisfactory, we must, it would seem, take זהב as a corruption of צבה (=׳ישמ); ו[זהב] represents a dittograph. Lastly, to complete a successful restoration, אשר שם must be corrected into אֲשֶׁר ישמעאל, שם into ישמ׳ (cp. on v. 32), and טוב into ׳תוב, *i.e.* תובל (see on Judg. xi. 3). The whole passage after חוילה now becomes אֲשֶׁר ישמעאל [צבה] והארץ ההיא תובל [ישמעאל], עֵרֶב ירחמאל [עֵרֶב ישמעאל], 'Asshur-Ishmael [Ṣobah]; now that land is Tubal [Ishmael], Arabia of Ishmael.' Glosses and sub-glosses on the interesting name 'Ḥavîlah.'

Now as to the trees in the garden. All the trees of Eden were glorious (Ezek. xxxi. 8, 9, 16, 18), but the most fragrant were those around the throne of Elohim (Enoch xxiv. 2, 3), and of these the chief was the tree of life (Enoch xxv. 3-5, Slav. Enoch viii. 3), or of wisdom (Enoch xxxii. 3). That there were two magic trees, we have seen to be improbable. The tree of life is also the tree of knowledge or wisdom (p. 76); perfect knowledge would of course enable a man to escape death.[1] Let us take the chief passages in order.

(*a*) ii. 9. 'And Yahweh-Elohim made to spring out of the ground every tree, etc., and the tree of life in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.' The phrase עץ הדעת טוב ורע is extremely obscure;[2] as Kautzsch and Socin remark, 'the closing words of *v.* 9 drag.' The explanation seems to be that עץ הדעת is a gloss on עץ החיים, derived from a second form of the Paradise-story, while טוב ורע is probably corrupted from בְּטַבּוּר הארץ, 'on the navel of the earth' (cp. Ezek. xxxviii. 12, v. 5, Jubilees viii. 12, 19, Eth. Enoch xxvi. 1). The mountain of Paradise (like Parnassus, Pind. *Pyth.* iv. 74) had for one of

[1] Cp. the Hebrew story of Enoch; Adapa (Adamu?) is different.

[2] One would gladly think (with Jastrow, *RBA*, p. 553, note) that 'good and evil' meant 'everything,' or perhaps 'the secrets of heaven and earth.' But the phrases in xxiv. 50, xxxi. 24 are not parallel.

its names 'earth's navel.' Probably the words בטבור הארץ are the original reading, for which the plainer phrase בתוך הגן was substituted when the myth was reconstructed without reference to a mountain. In passing, let it be noticed that the original myth which underlies Ezek. xxxviii. *f.* must have referred to an attack by some hostile power (Tiâmat?) on the Divine Beings on the mountain of Paradise ('earth's navel'). Ezekiel (if it be Ezekiel) altered this. The sacred mountain became Mount Zion or Jerusalem; its inhabitants became the Jews; its assailants the typical foes of Israel—the N. Arabian peoples.[1]

(*b*) ii. 17. How strange that the hidden virtue of the tree (as communicating a special kind of knowledge) should be already mentioned! Contrast iii. 3. Budde suggests that 'when the second tree was introduced, the [supposed] proper name of the tree had to be substituted for the phrase "the tree in the midst of the garden."'[2] Our explanation (see above) is fuller. The original myth had, 'but of the tree on the Navel of the Earth thou shalt not eat.' When the corruption had taken place, the redactor, to make sense, inserted הדעת.

(*c*) iii. 5, 'As soon as ye eat of it, your eyes will be opened, and ye will be as Elohim, knowing good and evil.' ידעי טוב ורע is redactional. The godlikeness promised in the original story was partly a strange heightening of the vitality, partly a knowledge of secrets. Cp. Eth. Enoch xxv. 5, 6, 'by its fruit life will be given to the elect . . . the fragrance thereof will be in their limbs'; and xxxii. 3, 'the tree of wisdom which imparts great wisdom to those who eat of it.'

(*d*) (*e*) iii. 7, iii. 22 *a*. It was not in 'knowing good and evil,' nor in 'knowing that they were naked' (the sexual distinction), that the first men became like Elohim. לדעת טוב ורע is redactional. See above (*c*).

(*f*) iii. 22 *b*, 23 *a*. The redactor is responsible for the insertion of גַּם. According to the original text the Deity feared that man might go on constantly taking of the fruit

[1] Following, with important modifications, Winckler, *AOF* ii. 163 *f.*; Gressmann, *Eschatol.* pp. 183 *ff.*

[2] *Die Bibl. Urgesch.* p. 50. So Toy, *JBL* x. (1891), p. 12.

of the tree of life, and so live for ever. Read probably[1] פן־ישלח עוד ידו ולקח מֵהעץ ואכל וחי לעלם אשלחהו מֵהגן See p. 76 (foot).

Two more subjects, seldom treated, but surely not unimportant, still remain—the names of the first man and his wife, and the name of God. What, then, is the name of the first man?

The Yahwist, as the text now stands, generally calls him הָאָדָם. In ii. 20, iii. 17, 21, however, we find לְאָדָם, and in iv. 25 אָדָם, as if אָדָם were a proper name.[2] In fact, if the first woman had an individualising name, how can the first man have been without one? It would seem to follow that האדם must have displaced some other word, which stood in the original text as the name of the first man, and many parallels suggest that by some slight modification of האדם we can recover that name. Now the more we look into this and the accompanying narratives, the more clearly we see their Yeraḥme'elite or Arabian origin. Can we hesitate any longer as to the first man's name? It was not Adapa (Zimmern, Winckler), or perhaps (see Sayce, *Exp. Times*, June 1906, p. 416) Adamu, though this wise son of a wiser divine father (Ea) is certainly analogous to the first man of the Hebrews, but a name which indicated the race of which he was to be the progenitor. In short, it was probably either אדום or ארם (cp. on אדם, Josh. iii. 16, Hos. vi. 7), which of course will imply that the earliest race of men were either the Edomites or the Aramites.[3] In illustration of this it may be mentioned that in Ezek. xxviii. 3 דנאל (like ארנון and רענן) most probably comes from רמאל, *i.e.* ירחמאל, and in Isa. xiv. 12 הילל בן־שחר from ירחמאל בן־אַשְׁחָר, both, as the contexts show, names of the first man. We may also refer to what has been said already on the wisdom of the Yeraḥme'elites,

[1] Such a word as עוד might easily be inserted or omitted, according to the redactor's convenience. Cp. iv. 25, where עוד (omitted by 𝔊) is generally admitted to be redactional.

[2] Cp. Schrader, *Stud. zur Krit. u. Erklär. der Bibl. Urgesch.* (1863), p. 124.

[3] Cp. Num. xxiv. 20, 'Amalek (= Yeraḥme'el) was the first of the nations.' This is a common form of racial self-esteem. The Egyptians called themselves *rōmet*, *i.e.* 'men.'

and on the Yerahme'elite elements in the earliest wisdom-literature (Prov. x. 1, xxx. 1, xxxi. 1, underlying text). For a fuller form of the first man's name see perhaps iii. 24 (note).

Now as to the name of the first woman. 'This one this time is bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh; this one shall be called Isshah, for from Ish[1] has she been taken.' So runs the text of ii. 23, but how improbably! Take first זאת הפעם. Surely זאת cannot be taken adverbially = 'now.'[2] הפעם ('this time') is an interpolation consequent on the insertion of *vv.* 19, 20, which interrupt the connexion.[3] Omit it, and זאת can have its natural meaning 'this one.' Then take the pronouncement that 'this one shall be called Isshah,' etc. What an insipid remark![4] To deal with it successfully we must first explain the apparently superfluous word זאת at the end. The word is plainly corrupt; does the doctrine of recurrent types of corruption help us? Surely it does. Why may not this troublesome זאת, like ישת in ix. 21 (see note), have come from אשתר? Why, too, may not איש have come from אשור? It will be remembered that 'Asshur,' 'Ashḥur,' and 'Ashtar' are different forms of the same Arabian name (see pp. 23, 70). Thus the latter part of the pronouncement becomes, 'for out of Ashḥur has she been taken,' with a gloss 'Ashtar.'

But before proceeding further, we must consider the text of the parallel passage (for such it really is), iii. 20. The text, rendered literally, runs thus, 'And the man called his wife Ḥawwah, for she has become the mother of all living.' That חַוָּה and כל־חי are not right, should be clear. (*a*) Let us begin with חַוָּה. According to most,[5] this is an archaistic survival of a formation from √חוה (Phœn. חוא = Heb. חיה). Scholars then proceed to compare the חוה inferred from the plural form חַוֹּת in Num. xxxii. 41, etc., 'tent-

[1] 𝔊, Sam., Onk. read מְאִישָׁה, a poor makeshift.

[2] Stade, *ZATW*, 1897, pp. 210-212.

[3] Van Doorninck, *Th. Tijdschr.* 1905, pp. 231 *f.* Observe that the close of *v.* 20 awkwardly brings us back to the point reached at the end of *v.* 18

[4] Van Doorninck, *Th. Tijdschr.* 1905, pp. 231 *f.*

[5] *E.g.* Schröder, *Die Phön. Spr.* p. 18; Cooke, *North Sem. Inscr.* p. 135.

villages(?),' or 'tents of a clan or kindred,'[1] and to explain the name חַוָּה as kinship personified (see *b*). Nöldeke, Ed. Meyer, and Wellh., however, have revived the old interpretation of Clem. Alex. (also *OS* 164, 64, and *Ber. rabba*, par. xx.), ὄφις; cp. Aram. חויא, Ar. *ḥayyat*, 'serpent.'[2] If tradition had given us a serpent-creator, this might be just plausible; but the greatest of the serpents is the enemy of God and man.

(*b*) Next, as to כל־חי. Robertson Smith, after Nöldeke, supposes that Ḥawwah was so called 'because she was the mother of every *ḥayy* (female kinship group).' The objection is twofold. (1) In these primitive stories the first man and woman are simply tribal ancestors. And (2) in a passage (1 Sam. xviii. 18) in which the same meaning 'clan' is given to חַי (in חַיִּי [Wellh., Driv.]; MT., חַיַּי), we can hardly acquit Nöldeke, Wellhausen, and Driver of hastiness. For where is there any parallel for this sense in a plain sentence? Gen. iii. 20 cannot safely be adduced, for it has suspicious features. The probability is that just as איים repeatedly represents ערבים, so חי in Gen. and חיי in 1 S. are corrupt fragments of אשחור. Then, as to אם כל; 'mother of all Ashḥur' is possible, but not very probable. In Ps. xliv. 12 מאכל is a corruption of ירחמאל: so too, in 2 S. xi. 1, מלאכים has come from ירחמאלים. Now we know that Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el or Yeraḥme'el-Ashḥur often occurs as the name of a region of N. Arabia with which the Israelites had close relations. What reading, then, is so natural as this, כי הוא היתה אם ירחמאל אשחור, 'for she has become the mother of Yeraḥme'el-Ashḥur'; *i.e.* אם represents both אִם, 'mother,' and the first two letters of ירחמאל = מאכל?

Thus it is probable that איש in ii. 23 should be corrected into אשור (= אשתר), and equally so that not only חוה in iii. 20, but אשה in ii. 23, should be אַשְׁחֹרָה. The two passages—ii. 23 and iii. 20—will now run thus, 'And

[1] See Moore, *Judges*, p. 275.

[2] Cooke, p. 135, compares Ḥawwath, the name of a Punic goddess of the underworld. See above, p. 53. Ed. Meyer (*Die Israelit.* p. 427, 1), following B. Luther, makes 'Leah' the name of a serpent-demon (cp. on xxix. 16).

Arām said, This one is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; this one shall be called Ashḥūrah, for out of Ashḥur[1] has she been taken'; and, 'And Arām called his wife's name Ashḥūrah, for she has become the mother of [the race of] Yeraḥme'el-Ashḥur.' The two notices appear to have been taken from different versions of the old story.

Lastly, the important question arises, What was the name of the divine Creator, according to the original form of the Paradise-story? As the text stands it was *Yahweh Elohim* (יהוה אלהים). We should rather have expected 'Yahweh' alone. The combination occurs throughout the section ii. 4 *b*-iii. (note, however, iii. 1 *b*, 3, 5 *a*, where 'Elohim' occurs alone), also in Ex. ix. 30, 2 S. vii. 22, Ps. lxxii. 18, lxxxiv. 12, Jon. iv. 6, 1 Chr. xvii. 16, and according to 𝔊 in passages in Gen. iv.-x. and especially in Ezek. xl.-xlviii.[2] י׳ האלהים occurs in 1 S. vi. 20, 1 Chr. xxii. 1, 19, 2 Chr. xxvi. 18, xxxii. 16. Budde[3] has endeavoured to show that the combination י׳ אל׳ in the Paradise-story is due to the redactor, who combined two Yahwistic strata, in one of which the name of God was Yahweh, in the other Elohim, a view which Gunkel (p. 4) accepts, and Cornill,[4] who, in Ezek. xl. *ff.*, follows 𝔊 in reading אל׳ י׳, regards this reading as a confirmation of Budde's view. But may we not—must we not demand that a theory should be devised which will explain the phrase everywhere, for instance in Ex. ix. 30 and Jon. iv. 6? Must we not hold that 'Elohim' when attached to 'Yahweh' is a corruption of, or a substitute for, some recognised divine name? Prof. Barton[5] comes very near this view when he says that 'Yahweh' and 'Elohim' were different tribal names

[1] *I.e.* out of Ashḥur-Aram, or Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el. This was the fuller name of the first man (see on iii. 24).

[2] Sievers (p. 171) holds, on metrical grounds, that in chap. i. the name of God was originally, not Elohim, but a compound name, analogous to the Yahweh-Elohim of chaps. ii. and iii.

[3] *Die Bibl. Urgesch.* pp. 232-235.

[4] *Ezechiel*, pp. 174 *f.* According to Cornill, the prophet Ezekiel wished to indicate by the adoption of the compound name of God that his vision of the new Jerusalem was parallel to the story of the lost Paradise.

[5] *JBL* xx. (1901), p. 23.

of the Deity, and compares Melek-Ashtart, a combination of the names of two deities of kindred origin. Elohim, however, is not a *name* of any special god, but a generic term for 'god.' And the new suggestion here made is this, that אלהים is, in many passages (*e.g.* iii. 1 *b*, etc., iv. 25), a substitute for ירחמאל, suggested in the first instance by corruptly written forms of that name. 'Yahweh-Elohim' therefore, it may be held, has come from 'Yahweh-Yeraḥme'el,' a compound name like Ashtar-Kemôsh, Melek-Ashtart, etc. At some undeterminable point of the pre-exilic period this compound name gave offence, and the second element in it was changed into 'Elohim.' But for us the old phrase is more interesting than the new. It records the fact that, though the Israelites retained 'Yeraḥme'el' as a divine name, they subordinated this god to the greater god Yahweh.[1]

We can now throw some light on a phrase (iii. 8) by which one of the keenest of literary critics[2] confesses himself baffled:—'And they heard the sound of Yahweh-Elohim (-Yeraḥme'el) walking in the garden לרוח היום, at the wind of the day,' or (as Schultens)[3] 'at the breathing-time of the day.' But why not לִפְנוֹת עֶרֶב? Indeed, why refer to the evening at all (cp. 2 S. v. 24)? Considering what has been said on רוח אלהים in i. 2 *b*, may we not hold that לרוח היום has come from ירחמאל אלהים (cp. on מלאך אל, xxi. 17), which is a possible variant to יהוה אלהים? 'They heard the sound of Yahweh-Elohim (or, Yeraḥme'el-Elohim) taking his walk in the garden.'

The last problems are those of iii. 24, which runs in MT., 'and he stationed eastward of the garden of Eden the cherubim, and the flame of the whirling sword, to guard the way to the tree of life.' From this we might infer that one tradition placed Paradise in the far west (cp. iv. 16). So, in fact, Gunkel thinks, adding that the MT. of ii. 8 places it in the east. If, however, we admit that מקדם in ii. 8 has come from רקם[4] ('Eden of Reḳem'), we shall

[1] Originally, as stated elsewhere, Yāhū (whence Yahweh) was a formation of Yaḥu, *i.e.* Yarḥu (Yarḥam, Yeraḥme'el).

[2] Van Doorninck, *Th. T.*, May 1905, p. 227.

[3] *Liber Jobi* (1737), ii. 189, 'Nempe ad vesperam dies quasi suspirat.'

[4] רקם = ירחם = ירחמאל.

see the choice before us. We may either (1) follow 𝔊 (see Ball, and Ges.[13], p. 842 *b*), making אתו (האדם) the object of וישכן, and inserting וַיָּשֶׂם (𝔊 *καὶ ἔταξε*) before את־כ׳, or (2) pronounce 𝔊 to be arbitrary, and read, for וישכן מקדם, אשחר רקם (Ashḥur-Reḳem), a correcting gloss on האדם, giving the name of the first man as Ashḥur-Reḳem (Ashḥur-Yarḥam). In either case we should insert וישם as the verb of which את־הכ׳ is the object. Thus we get, 'And he drove out the man [Ashḥur-Reḳem], and appointed for the garden of Eden the cherubim,' etc.

It is singular that the narrative should give us two guardians of the sacred road—the cherubim and the flame of the whirling sword (so there were two traditions)—and that it should not be stated to whom the sword belongs. The cherubim are at once the throne-bearers and the guardians of the sanctuary in Hebrew mythology. The sword is Yahweh-Yeraḥme'el's sword, which, as Isa. xxxiv. 5 shows, has an inherent vitality, and can 'come down on the people banned by' the great God. It is not necessary, therefore, to question חרב (with Winckler, *AOF*, 3rd ser. iii. 392). The sword corresponds to Marduk's weapon called mulmul[1] (javelin). In Josh. v. 13 *f.* it is in the hand of the divine Captain, *i.e.* doubtless Yeraḥme'el (= Mal'ak Yahweh). It is, in fact, the lightning. As to the 'cherubim' a further statement seems necessary, though a complete discussion here of the Biblical passages is impossible.[2] In Ps. xviii. 10 we find a 'cherub' parallel to the 'wings of the wind.' Probably there was an early conception of the cherub as a bird. It may well have been suggested by a still more archaic view that the chief Divine Being, from whom came creation and from whom come those storms which seem like acted prophecies of a future new creation, was himself a mighty bird. Mythological analogies abound; see p. 9, and note further that the Sioux Indians suppose thunder to be the flapping of the cloud-bird's wings. Ezekiel's cherubim are probably in part his own invention. But we can well believe that the bird-cherubim were followed or accompanied by more elaborate composite forms,

[1] Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 332.
[2] See *E. Bib.*, and *E. Brit.*, 'Cherubim.'

analogous to the winged figures of bulls and lions with human faces which guarded Babylonian and Assyrian temples and palaces. As to the *name*, it is remarkable that one of the deities of the land of Ya'di in N. Syria is called רכבאל,[1] *i.e.* possibly Rekūbel,[2] which seems to be, like other names, of Arabian origin. Comparing the כרוב in Ezra ii. 59, the כבר in Ezek. i. 1, and the רכב in 2 K. x. 15, etc., we may probably interpret hak-kerūbīm 'the Yeraḥme'els,' *i.e.* the animals representing Yeraḥme'el. It is a slight confirmation of this that in Enoch xxiv. Michael (the deputy of Yahweh, and the successor of the ancient Yeraḥme'el) is stated to be in charge of the tree of life;[3] in Ps. civ. 3, however, the psalmist apparently interprets כרוב as meaning 'chariot (of God).' For the application of the divine name to the symbol of the god, we may compare אֲשֵׁרִים, underlying the שׂעירים (see p. 24), and perhaps the colossal lions called *nergalli*, representing some Babylonian deity, perhaps Nergal. Such lion-forms might well be imagined as guarding the sacred road. Cp. Ezek. xli. 18 *f.* (1 K. vi. 29), where it is said that 'every cherub had two faces' (of a man and of a lion), and that cherubs and palm-trees were combined (the palm-tree may be the tree of life). Strictly speaking, *kerūb* (cherub) should be *rekūb*, which is a shortened form of *rekūbel*.[4]

[1] See Cooke, *N. Sem. Inscr.* No. 61, 2; 62, 22; 63, 5. Cp. the Sab. name כרבאל, Kittel, *Könige*, p. 52.

[2] Most explain 'chariot of God' or 'charioteer of God'; but this may be questioned.

[3] It is true that in Enoch xx. 7 (and in the Gizeh Gk.) Gabriel is spoken of as 'over Paradise and the serpents and the cherubim'; but Gabriel is only a double of Michael (see *Expositor*, April 1906, pp. 295, 297). I see no reason to think (with Bousset, *Rel. des Jud.*[(2)], p. 378) that Gabriel was originally the highest angel, but had to yield the first place to Michael. Michael and Gabriel are both names of the 'degraded' god Yeraḥme'el, and the personage referred to, or his 'son,' was probably the 'Man' of Jewish eschatology.

[4] That רכב is = רכבאל appears from the name of the son of Panammu, viz. Bar-rekūb, who speaks in his inscription of 'my lord Rekūbel' (lines 5-7).

CAIN AND ABEL (GEN. IV. 1-16)

THE brothers Ḳain and Abel (Hebel); the latter slain. As Stade (*ZATW*, 1894, p. 282) has pointed out, *vv.* 1, 2, and 16 *b* are redactional, *i.e.* they were inserted to connect the story of Ḳain and Hebel with that of Paradise. He also thinks that the former story has no connexion with the genealogy of the Ḳainites. This may be granted, though the Ḳain of the story is just as much the eponym of the Ḳenites as the Ḳain of *vv.* 17-24. It is plausible to explain Ḳain 'artificer,' and to regard it as the translation of a title of the divine demiurge, derived ultimately from Babylonia (*E. Bib.*, 'Cain,' § 1; 'Cainites,' § 5). Our principle of grouping similar names leads us, however, to suppose that קין (cp. Josh. xv. 57) and קינן (v. 9) must, equally with חנוך, be connected with ענן, ענק, and כנען, all of which appear to be in their origin N. Arabian. That קין is specially N. Arabian appears also from the compound name Tubal-ḳain (*v.* 22), *i.e.* Ethbaal-ḳain (see on x. 2); for 'Ethbaal' is certainly a corrupt form of Ishmael.

Next, as to Abel (Hebel). The mother surely said something at his birth which has been lost. It may be presumed that she interpreted the name Hebel 'a breath, vanity.' But what, the critic asks, is the true meaning? Close to Tubal-ḳain (*vv.* 20-22) we find the names Yābāl and Yūbāl—both cognates of Hebel. Evidently all these names are N. Arabian. We must therefore reject Lenormant's plausible connexion of הבל with Ass. *ablu*, *aplu*, 'son,' as well as the other connexion proposed in *E. Bib.*, 'Abel,' supported though it is by Hommel (Ass. *ibilu*, 'ram, camel, ass'). The element בל in Hebrew names so often represents מאל, a fragment of ירחמאל or ישמעאל (*e.g.* in

עיבל, ארבל, אשבל), that we can hardly avoid tracing הבל (חבל), as well as יבל and יובל, to ירחמאל.[1] It is a contest between two Yerahme'elite or Arabian tribes, one nomadic, the other with a fixed abode, of which the legend in its original form appears to have spoken. The Hebel tribe had to pay tribute to the Ḳain tribe,[2] in order to be freed from such raids as are described in Judg. vi. 3-5. The tribute apparently was in arrears; a struggle naturally ensued, and Hebel perished. In the present form of the legend, the statement respecting Ḳain's original mode of life ('a tiller of the ground,' *v.* 2), and all that hangs together with it, is incorrect.

It now becomes possible to explain קניתי איש את־יהוה in *v.* 1. Not by reading לְעֻמַּת for את, though it is psychologically probable that 'Eve' congratulated herself on having 'created' a man. So too Erbt, who inserts וקנאתי, 'and have stirred up to jealousy' (*Urgesch.* pp. 9, 19). איש אֹת יהוה (Marti, Zeydner) is surely impossible. The probability is that here, as elsewhere, יהוה has sprung from ירח׳ (*i.e.* ירחמאל). In *v.* 2 we find את־הבל; את־ירח׳ may be a marginal gloss upon this.

Why the offerings of the two brothers were regarded differently by Yahweh does not appear. We should have expected that Ḳain's would be accepted, and Abel's refused, for surely in the olden times God had more pleasure in the fruits of the field than in bloody sacrifices.[3] Has the original legend been altered in deference to later beliefs? Probably, and in any case the text of *vv.* 6-8 is open to much suspicion. My friend Prof. Driver admits this for *v.* 7, though he thinks that the text may be so interpreted as to convey 'a profound psychological truth—the danger, viz., of harbouring a sullen and unreasoning discontent.' To avoid ascribing such psychological reasoning to an early narrator, I have tried to feel my way towards an

[1] Winckler (*Ar.-sem.-or.* pp. 110 *f.*) suggests that Heb. *hebel* and Ar. *Hobal* (divine name) may be identical. Does this give a clue to the origin of Hobal?

[2] The Ḳain tribe is not a tribe of smiths as Eerdmans (*Th. Tijdschr.* xl. 231) supposes. Cp. on Tubal-ḳain, *v.* 22.

[3] See *ZDMG* xxxi. 358.

earlier text[1] (see *Exp. Times*, vol. x., July 1899; *E. Bib.*, 'Cain,' § 2). Independently, Prof. Gunkel agrees with me so far as to read תִּשָּׂא for שְׂאֵת and תפל for לפת[ח]. But though the text is hardly quite original, it is not clear that it need be altered, provided that *v.* 7 is regarded as a late interpolation. It has been overlooked that הלא is one of the usual introductory formulæ of glosses (*Crit. Bib.*, p. 474). *V.* 6 and *v.* 8 then come to stand together, and of course the opening of *v.* 8 needs to be corrected. Probably for אחיו we should read אחי, and make the clause run thus, 'And Ḳain said, Because of my brother Abel.' Some answer of Ḳain to the divine questioner is certainly needed. The ו now attached to אחי seems a dittograph.

The 'sign' appointed to Ḳain seems clear enough; we can hardly, with Driver, call it 'idle to speculate.'[2] As W. R. Smith says, 'Can this be anything else than the *šarṭ* or tribal mark which every man bore on his person, and without which the ancient form of blood-feud . . . could hardly have been worked?'[3] This also illustrates Isa. xliv. 5, Ezek. ix. 4, and Zech. xiii. 6, where tattooed sacred marks of Yahweh-Yeraḥme'el appear to be meant. See Stade, 'Das Kainzeichen,' *ZATW*, 1894, pp. 250-318; *Bibl. Theol.* i. 42, and cp. Jensen's note, *KB* vi. 377. As the narrative stands, the 'sign' is an evidence of Yahweh's compassion for Ḳain. Otherwise the sympathies of the narrator are with Abel.

Where were the chief haunts of the Ḳain tribe when the legend was redacted? In the land of Nod (נוֹד), is the answer. No good explanation of this name has been offered. No doubt, like so many monosyllabic forms in MT., it is a mutilation of some longer, well-known name. Probably we should read נדב, *i.e.* Nadab or Nodab. This was the name of a people of N. Arabian connexions (see *E. Bib.*, 'Nodab').[4] 'Eastward of Eden' is probably a correct gloss; Eden (see pp. 87 *f.*) was a N. Arabian locality.

[1] See also Box, *Exp. Times*, x. 425 *ff.*, for an excellent suggestion on the closing words of *v.* 7 (cp. iii. 16).

[2] 'Speculate,' indeed, is an invidious expression.

[3] *Kinship*, pp. 215 *f.*; ed. 2, p. 251; cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Cain.'

[4] For another view see *E. Bib.*, col. 4413.

CAIN'S GENEALOGY (GEN. IV. 17-24 [26])

ḲAIN'S genealogy, which, with *vv.* 25 *f.* and a prefixed passage now lost, forms the sequel of *v.* 1. Besides Dillmann, etc., see *E. Bib.*, 'Cainites,' and cp. 'Sethites.' It is hoped that some fresh light can be thrown on these names. First comes the name of the son of Ḳain (Ḳenites)—Ḥanôk.[1] It has been connected or misconnected with various ancient place-names, but really belongs to the same group as Ḳain (see above). Note that ʿAnâḳ also appears as ʿAnôḳ (Josh. xxi. 11), and Kenaʿan as Kinaḫḫi in *Am. Tab.* We find Ḥanôk elsewhere as a Reubenite[2] and a Midianite place-name (xlvi. 9, xxv. 4); it is also known as a S. Arabian tribe-name (Hommel, *Gr.* p. 163, note 3). One may suppose that Ḥanôk is one of the cities of the Kenites (1 S. xxx. 29). Possibly, however, the חנוך at the end of *v.* 17 is misplaced, and should stand after וידי.[3] If so, the name of the city will be עירד (if this form be correct). In fact, we know of no city called Ḥanôk, but we do know of one called עֲרָד (Josh. xii. 14; cp. Judg. i. 16). Very possibly עירד (the ירד of v. 15) should be ערוד, another form of ערד. Cp. also ארוד, x. 18, Ezek. xxvii. 8 (with notes), אדר, Josh. xv. 3. Hommel's derivation from עי, 'fire,' and ירד, 'to descend,' hardly commends itself.

[1] There is no connexion with √חנך, nor yet with Unuki, the ideographic name of Erech. If Ḥanôk were virtually the Babylonian city Erech, we should have expected to find Gilgamesh referred to, Erech being the city of Gilgamesh. See, further, on v. 23 *f.*, and on נח, v. 29.

[2] 'Reuben' was originally a N. Arabian tribe, as we can still discern underneath the present text of 1 Chr. v. 6, 9 *f.* The 'king of Asshur' spoken of is an Arabian king; the river Pĕrāth is an Arabian stream (p. 91). Cp. *Crit. Bib.* pp. 371 *f.*

[3] So in effect Winckler, *AOF*(3), i. 95. For another view see Budde, *Urgesch.* pp. 120 *ff.*

'Mehujael' and 'Methushael' have both been terribly misunderstood. Prof. H. P. Smith[1] even renders the former 'wiped out by God,' and the latter (after Redslob) 'man of Sheól,' and comments 'vanished tribes like 'Ad and Thamûd.' Prof. D. H. Müller, though more methodical, is just as wrong, when he explains מחוייאל '(the god) יאל gives life.' Surely מחויאל and מהללאל (v. 12, Neh. xi. 4) have the same origin. The former comes from ירחמאל through מחריאל, the latter through מחאל; cp. הלם, 1 Chr. vii. 35, and יהללאל (1 Chr. iv. 16), also מחלי, מחלת, etc. For the repetition of ל cp. לאל, Num. iii. 24, and למואל, Prov. xxxi. 1, 4. It may be noticed that some cursives (*a*, *b*, *z*) in iv. 18 give *μαλελεηλ*, and that the Ethiopic has Malāleēl, and the Coptic Maleleēl.[2] As for מתושאל, Lenormant's explanation *mutu-ša-ili*[3] ('liegeman of God,' *E. Bib.*, 'Cainites,' § 7) is at first sight plausible. But the retention of *ša* is improbable, and it is very doubtful whether מת or מתו, 'man,' can be supported lexicographically. Certainly it is more in accordance with sound method to explain מתו both here and in מתושלח (which 𝔊 apparently reads in iv. 18 in place of מתושאל) as a fragment of מתול = תמול[4] (cp. משאל, אתבעל), *i.e.* ישמעאל, and to group שאל either with שאול (xxxvi. 37, xlvi. 10, see notes), or with אשכל, *i.e.* אשחר ירחמאל (see on xiv. 13). מתושלח (v. 21) probably comes from תמול כשלח (cp. on 'Casluhim,' x. 14).

'Lamech' too has been a fertile theme of unfruitful discussion. Explanations from the Sumerian (*Lamga*, a non-Semitic title of the moon-god; Sayce, Boscawen, Hommel) are as forced and improbable as those from the Arabic (*juvenis robustus*, Dillm.). Undoubtedly, למך, like מלך (as a divine name), with its feminine מלכה (xi. 29), and קמואל (xxii. 21), has sprung from ירחמאל. The corruption may have arisen very early. Cp. *E. Bib.*, cols. 625 *f.*—Next, as to Lamech's two wives. Evidently עדה and צלה are corruptions of well-known names. The latter is the feminine of צל = צלם, *i.e.* ישמעאל (see on Num. xiv. 19, xxvi. 33).

[1] *Old Test. History* (1903), p. 24.

[2] Lagarde (*Orientalia*, ii. 35) prefers Mahalalel; cp. Nestle, *Marginalien* (1893), p. 7.

[3] *Origines de l'histoire*[(2)], i. 262 *f.* [4] See *Crit. Bib.* on 1 S. x. 11.

Ṣillah (cp. Ṣillethai, b. Shimei, 1 Chr. viii. 20) represents an Ishmaelite tribe. The former should be synonymous with צלה (cp. 'Yabal' and 'Yubal'). Possibly עדה represents אדמיה or ערביה.

And now as to the two sons of Adah and the son of Ṣillah (*vv.* 20-22). Their names respectively are יבל (Yabal) יובל (Yubal), and תובל-קין (Tubal-ḳain), or, as in 𝔊, Ἰωβηλ, Ἰουβαλ, and Θοβελ. According to Ball, the first of these, like אוביל (1 Chr. xxvii. 30), is connected with Ar. *âbil*[un], 'one skilled in the tendance of camels, sheep,' etc.; the second with יוֹבֵל, קרן היובל (so Dillm.); the third with Sumerian Balgin, Bilgi, the fire-god (cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Cainites'). Dillmann, on the other hand, explains יבל 'nomadic shepherd' (cp. הוביל), יובל 'musician' (cp. Ball), while the קין appended to the ethnic תובל marks out the third hero as a smith, and perhaps also as a true descendant of Ḳain. A more comprehensive view of the relevant facts will show us that יבל and יובל, like הבל (iv. 2), אוביל (1 Chr. *l.c.*), and יובל in קרן היובל (Josh. vi. 4), come from ירחמאל, and תובל from אתבעל (see on *v.* 2 and on x. 2).

At first sight it will appear from the contexts as if these three personages were leaders of culture, and therefore, one may conjecture, semi-divine beings.[1] The contexts, however, on which this view depends are liable to grave suspicion. On *v.* 20, Kautzsch and Socin remark, 'The text is doubtless corrupt; probably the Regens of מקנה has fallen out.' Also on *v.* 22, 'The context hardly permits a doubt that אבי has fallen out before כל; לטש is presumably only an early gloss to חרש' (similarly Ball). Such superficial criticism is useless. We must go down deeper, and examine the suspicious words in the light of other passages in which these words occur, but are certainly corrupt.

The most suspicious word of all is לֹטֵשׁ (*v.* 22). חרש needs no gloss, and if a gloss were required, such an uncommon word as לטש would not have been chosen. The key to the word is supplied by xxv. 3, where לטושם, standing between אשורם and לאמים (from ירחמאלים), has, of course, been produced, mainly by transposition of letters, from

[1] One might conjecture that there were originally but two—a pair of Semitic Dioscuri.

אשתאלים. לטש therefore = אשתאל (*i.e.* אשתר ירחמ', see on *v.* 25). Considering that Tubal-ḳain is most naturally explained as 'Ḳenite Ethbaal (Ishmael),' we cannot be surprised at this result. And what function is discharged by אש' here? It is a gloss on קין, *i.e.* the eponym of the Ḳenites. חֹרֵשׁ (omit כל with 𝔊) has, of course, a similar origin. Like חרשת from אִשְׁחֹרֶת (Judg. iv. 2), חרשא (Ezra ii. 52), and the name חרשין in the Assuan papyri[1] (B 22), it comes from the regional name אשחר (cp. חרס and שיחור). נחשת וברזל is also a pair of glosses on תובל-קין. נחשת comes from חשתן, *i.e.* Ashḥur-ethan, while ברזל, as also probably in Dt. iii. 11, iv. 20, xxxiii. 25, comes from עֲרַב ישמעאל,[2] 'Ishmaelite Arabia' (cp. 'Barzillai'). Thus the passage becomes 'Tubal-ḳain [Ashtael, Ashḥur, Ḥashtan, Arab-Ishmael].'

Let us now turn back to *v.* 20. ישב מקנה is obviously impossible. Halévy and Ball would therefore read ישב אהלי מ', following 𝔊 and comparing 2 Chr. xiv. 14. But as Hommel has seen, מקנה in 2 Chr. *l.c.* has sprung from an ethnic, and I think it is possible to restore the right ethnic. מקנה has arisen out of רקמן, a form of ירחמאל (cp. on xlvi. 32, Judg. x. 5), and the ו prefixed to מ' in iv. 20 (MT.) probably comes from הוא ('that is'). That אהל may be a corruption of ירחמ' (see on xxxvi. 2), ישב of ישמ' (see on Isa. x. 13), and אבי of ערב (see on ix. 18, xxxiii. 19), cannot well be denied. הוא introduces the gloss; היה is either redactional or from a dittographed הוא. Thus we get, as the original of *v.* 20, 'And Adah (?) brought forth Yabal [that is, Arab-Ishmael; אהל, that is, Yeraḥme'el].'

And what of Yubal (*v.* 21)? אבי is now plain; תפש (as in Jer. xlvi. 9) probably comes from שפת (cp. on שפט, 1 K. xix. 19), *i.e.* צפת, צרפת. ككור is also corrupt (cp. on Josh. xix. 35, 2 S. vi. 5, Isa. xxx. 32); we may restore either רקון (Josh. xix. 46), or, better, עקרון. 'There was a Zarephathite Ekron, which the Danites may for a time have conquered.'[3] In fact, עקר probably represents אשחר (cp. on

[1] I am sorry that the editor should be puzzled by this name.

[2] Cp. ברקום (Ezra ii. 53), *i.e.* ערב־כוש, and the Palmyrene ברנבו, *i.e.* ערב־נבו, parallel to נבו א[ש]חר, Neh. vii. 33; and ברשמש, *i.e.* ערב ישמעאל.

[3] *Crit. Bib.* (p. 433) on Josh. xix.

ארך, x. 10). עוגב may have the same origin as עוג, אגב, and גוג; at any rate, like these, it represents some Arabian name. Thus, omitting כל as in *v.* 22, we get, 'And his brother's name was Yubal [that is, Arab-ṣephath, Ekron, and Og].'

It is with some surprise that in *v.* 22*b* we find the name of Tubal-ḳain's sister, viz. נעמה (cp. Josh. xv. 41). Its origin is not obscure. נעם, like מעון, should represent שמעון or ישמן, *i.e.* ישמעאל. It only remains to add that the insertion of 'Lamech's song' shows that, as there were two Ḳains, so there were also two Lamechs.[1] Also that the song referred to can hardly be archaic. As Winckler remarks,[2] no people on earth has poetical echoes of its nomad period. *Vv.* 25 *f.* are a genealogical fragment (cp. v. 29) which Stade (*Akad. Reden*, p. 247), after simplifying the form, would place before *v.* 17. What it gives us is an independent record of the birth of a son to the first man. 𝔊 is doubtless right in not recognising עוד. But to get further, textual criticism is necessary, and we must assume that שת and אנוש, not less than [ה]אדם and חוה, קין and הבל, represent well-known ethnics. שת is most probably a fragment of אשתר (cp. on ix. 21), as in Num. xxiv. 17 (the par., Jer. xlviii. 45, has שאון, *i.e.* ישמעאל). This is favoured by the words with which the passage about 'Sheth' must originally have closed, viz. not זרע אחר, but ז׳ אשחר (cp. on xxii. 13). The whole passage should probably run, 'And Aram knew his wife, and she conceived, and bore a son, and called his name Ashtar.' On this there was an early gloss, 'for (he was) the seed (*i.e.* offspring) of Asshur,' alluding to the probable fact (see on *v.* 24) that the fuller name of the first man was Asshur-Aram or A.-Yerahme'el. This involves omitting שת־לי אלהים and תחת הבל כי הרגו קין as redactional insertions. The alternative is to read, for שת לי, שתיל, and for אלהים (as often) ירחמאל, and to take שת in *v.* 24*a* as a fragment of אשתאל. This does not make much difference, for אשתאל (Judg. xiii. 25) and אשתון (1 Chr. iv. 11) have probably come from אשת, a fragment of אשתר; אל and ון are formative.[3] This gives us, 'And Aram

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Sethites,' § 3, and cp. Gunkel, *Genesis.*

[2] *Religionsgeschichtler und geschichtlicher Orient*, 1906, p. 27.

[3] Similarly, 'Eshtemoh' and 'Eshtemoa' have nothing to do with

knew his wife, etc., and she called his name Eshtaol (Ashtael), for (he was) a shoot of Yeraḥme'el, the seed of Asshur.' To connect אשתאל with שתיל, 'shoot,'[1] would not be worse than to connect the ethnic קין with קנה, 'to produce.' Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Seth.'

V. 26 is indeed a paradoxical passage. What? did not the father and mother of Enosh 'call with the name of Yahweh'? And if they did not, how can any one have done so before the time of Moses? The only choice is between the absolutely primitive origin of the solemn use of the divine name Yahweh and the Mosaic. I am well aware of the distinction that may be drawn between acquaintance with the divine name and the organisation of worship. I may be told that it is the latter which is assigned to Enosh as a most important detail in the development of culture (see *E. Bib.*, 'Cainites,' 'Sethites'). But we cannot discuss such a point until the text has been adequately treated, and then perhaps the whole question will appear to us in a new light. First of all, אז הוחל לקרא is impossible (see *E. Bib.*, 'Enos'). We may, of course (with Wellh., *CH*[(2)], p. 309), alter this into זה הֻחַל ל׳, following 𝔊, Vg., Jubilees. But how did זה become אז and החל become הוחל? And we shall find in due time that ויחל in ix. 20 and החל in x. 8 are both corrupt; also that formations from קרא are not seldom corruptions of ירחמאל. Most probably הוחל has come from הרחל (*i.e.* ירחמאל), and לקרא from a dittographed ירחמאל.[2] בשם יהוה represents בשם י׳,[3] and this has come from ערב־ישמן (*i.e.* ע׳ ישמעאל); the ער fell out all the more easily after רא. For other instances of a prefixed ב representing ערב, see on Ex. xxxi. 2; among them are בשמת and בשן. אנוש, as elsewhere (*e.g.* Jer. xvii. 16, Ps. ix. 20, lvi. 2), = ישמן = ישמעאל.[4] As for גם הוא, which reads strangely before יָלַד, it

the 8th Arabic conjugation, but come from 'Ashtar-Yeraḥme'el.' 'Eshtaol' ('Ashtael') too might have this origin.

[1] In the Mandæan writings the three 'helpers' of Adam are—Hibil, Shitil (cp. Aram. שיתלא, 'plant'), and Anôsh (Brandt, *Die Mand. Rel.* p. 122).

[2] קרא often represents a fragment of ירחמאל. Cp. קר[ו]אים, 2 S. xv. 11, Ezek. xxiii. 23.

[3] 𝔊's *κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ* is probably a mere expansion of יהוה.

[4] Cp. שאן, Jer. xlviii. 45, Hos. x. 14, Am. ii. 2; שאן[בית־], Josh.

is most probably a fragment of a gloss, which in its entirety ran, גם הוא עֵרָב (cp. on x. 21). Read, therefore, ולְאַשְׁתָּר [גם הוא עֵרָב] יָלַד־בן ויקרא את־שמו ישמעאל [ערב ירחמאל ערב ישמעאל], 'And to Ashtar [he too is Arāb] a son was born, whose name he called Ishmael [Arab-Yeraḥme'el, Arab-Ishmael].'

THE DESCENDANTS OF ADAM (GEN. V.)

HERE we have the second of the two parallel early Hebrew genealogies (J and P respectively), full of huge, ill-explained difficulties. Fragments of the first are to be found in iv. 25 *f.*, v. 29, and we may reasonably conjecture that the Yahwist's genealogy as well as that of the Priestly Writer originally contained ten names. It is also plausible to suppose that the ten heroes whom P certainly, and possibly also J, placed at the head of early history are ultimately connected with the ten antediluvian kings whom Berossus places at the head of the history of Babylonia,[1] and who correspond to the first ten months of a cosmic year. The names of these kings are Ἄλωρος, Ἀλάπαρος, Ἀμήλων, Ἀμμένων, Μεγαλάπαρος, Δάωνος, Εὐεδώραχος, Ἀμέμψινος, Ὠτιάρτης, Ξίσουθρος. An immediate connexion of the names in the two lists (Babylonian and Hebrew) cannot, however, be insisted upon, because of the difference of the names. The Hebrew list has a development behind it.

xvii. 11; עשן[כור־], 1. S. xxx. 30. All these forms, as is shown elsewhere, come from ישמעאל. Cp. p. 109 (on Num. xxiv. 17).

[1] Müller, *Fragm. Hist. Gr.* ii. 499 *f.*

Assyriologists, it is true,[1] think that Amelon, *i.e.* 'certainly' Ass. *amêlu*, 'man,' corresponds to the Hebrew *'enoš*, 'man'; that Ammenon, *i.e.* 'probably' Ass. *ummânu*, 'work-master,' = the Heb. Ḳênan, 'smith' (?); that Euedorachos, or more correctly Evedoranchos, *i.e.* Enmeduranki[2] (the name of a famous Babylonian hero, king of Sippara, the city of the sun-god, meaning perhaps 'high-priest of, or, one acquainted with (?), the place of union of heaven and earth'), corresponds to the Heb. Ḥanôk, which, superficially regarded, might mean 'initiation';[3] and that Amempsinos, *i.e.* Amêl-Sin, = the Heb. Methu-Šelaḥ, assuming *šelaḥ* to be a Hebraised form of *šarḫu*, 'brilliant,' which is an epithet of various Babylonian gods.[4]

But none of these comparisons are very solid. (1) 'Man,' as the name of a primeval hero, is highly improbable; 'man' or 'liegeman of (some god)' is but slightly more probable. More plausibly, indeed, one might compare Amelon (if it represents Amêl + *x*) with Mahalalel (*v.* 12), assuming -el (אל) to represent some more special divine name.[5] In my judgment, however, even this comparison is a misleading one, nor can I admit that either the Grecised Amelon or the Bab. Amêl in Amêl-Sin originally meant 'man,' or that 'Enosh' in iv. 26 is correct. (2) That Ḳain means 'artificer,' 'smith,' and that this is the title of a divine demiurge, possibly a translation of Ass. *ummânu*, is no doubt a plausible theory (see *E. Bib.*, 'Cain,' § 1; 'Cainites,' §§ 5, 10). But it is hazardous to separate Ḳain and Ḳenan from the group of related tribe- and place-names to which, as we have seen above, they belong. As for the Ammenon of

[1] See especially Hommel, *PSBA* xv. 243-246; Delitzsch, *Par.* p. 149; Zimmern, *KAT*, p. 531 *ff.*, 539 *ff.*

[2] This king is designated 'the favourite of Anu, Bel, and Ea,' and said to have been 'called (?) by the gods Šamaš and Adad into their fellowship,' also to have been initiated into the 'secrets of heaven and earth.' See Zimmern, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Bab. Religion*, p. 116, note *a*.

[3] Both names occupy the same place (No. 7) in the lists to which they respectively belong. This, however, is not very important (see *E. Bib.*, col. 4412, foot).

[4] The idea is Hommel's; *šarraḫu*, a Babylonian title of the moon-god. Cp. Zimmern, *Beitr.* pp. 152 *f.*, note 3.

[5] See *E. Bib.*, 'Cainites,' § 7.

Berossus, it may possibly represent Amnan; Amnânu is the name of an Arabian region, and probably represents Yamnânu, *i.e.* Yamanite (Yerahme'elite).[1] (3) As for Enmeduranki, we can hardly follow Barton and Peters[2] in connecting the Heb. name Ḥanôk with the last member of the Bab. name, viz. *anki* (*enki*), or Zimmern[3] in supposing that Ḥanôk means 'one initiated.' I would also venture to remark that the initiation of Enmedurankì into the 'secrets of heaven and earth' is by no means a distinctive feature. Other mythic personages such as Adapa (Adamu) and Xisuthros enjoyed this initiation, and became *abkallê*, 'sages,' and it is with Xisuthros that these inquiries lead me to connect both Ḥanôk and Noaḥ. (4) That Methu-šelaḥ is = 'man of the Brilliant' is highly improbable, nor is it even approximately certain (see above) that Amêl-Sin means 'man of the moon-god.'

We may, however, fully admit that Noaḥ, who, as the text stands (both in J and in P passages), is the hero of the Hebrew deluge-story, is, in virtue of his connexion with that story, parallel to the tenth Babylonian king, Xisuthros, and also that the story of Ḥanôk, as given by P, has well-marked mythological, and indeed Babylonian affinities. How comes it, then, that these two heroes bear names which have no Babylonian connexion? Why should they have been 'treated with more respect than other N. Arabian tribal heroes (in the two parallel genealogies), and raised to the rank of individuals, whose wonderful fortunes gave them a place by themselves, which only Elijah in a later age was privileged to share with them?'[4]

The question is greatly simplified if we identify Ḥanôk and the greater of the two Noaḥs (see below). We can then

[1] See Hommel, *Gr.* p. 263, and cp. *KAT*(3), pp. 487, 532.

[2] Barton, in Worcester's *Genesis in the Light of Modern Knowledge* (1901), p. 557; Peters, *Early Hebr. Story* (1904), p. 224. We should expect at least Duranki (the name of a mythic locality). Enki is the name of the Sumerian earth-god. This view reminds us of Prof. Sayce's derivation of Lamech (see p. 107).

[3] *KAT*, p. 540. This meaning is just such as a *late* writer might imagine. Tribal eponyms surely never had such names.

[4] Is there an allusion to Enoch in Ps. lxxiii. 24? Possibly. But see my *Psalms*(2), *ad loc.*

understand the striking parallelism between v. 22 and vi. 9; it was not, in the original writing, Noaḥ who 'walked with God,' but Ḥanôk. The question therefore asked above has only to be answered with reference to a single personage, viz. Ḥanôk.

At this point it is right to mention that in all probability the Hebrew legend of primeval times, as told by one of the writers known as J, had no deluge.[1] 'When, however, the deluge-story was adopted from the Yeraḥme'elites and converted into the story of the universal deluge, it had to be provided with a hero who was not a mere tribal eponym, and (for a reason suggested below) "Enoch" was selected to be converted into an individual, and even to assume something of the appearance of a solar hero, as was fitting for the hero of a story which, in its origin, was most probably an ether-myth (see p. 142). But a misfortune happened to him. At an early period (perhaps) after the deluge-story had been committed to writing, חנך became corrupted into חנ, which in turn was editorially altered (under the influence of a desire[2] to work the story of Noaḥ, the vine-planter, into the legend) into נח (Noaḥ) or נחם[3] (Naḥam?). Thus Enoch lost his connexion with the deluge, unless, indeed, we care to recognise the statement of Jubilees iv. 23, that Enoch, in Paradise, "wrote down all the wickedness of men, on account of which God brought the waters of the flood upon all the land of Eden." But, at any rate, he seems to have retained his superhuman wisdom,[4] and in later years attracted to himself more and more mythical elements.[5] Nor were the earlier traditionists unfair to him. When the list of ten heroes was constructed, he was placed (probably) at the end of the first pentad,[6] while

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Deluge,' § 14.

[2] See Budde, *Urgesch.*; and cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Noah.'

[3] Nāḥūm probably belongs to the same group of names; also Yanḫamu, the name of an Egyptian functionary (in *Am. Tab.* 61, 31, etc.), who superintended the affairs of the Egyptian domination in Palestine.

[4] To be taken to be with God implies initiation into the divine secrets. See below.

[5] See *E. Bib.*, 'Enoch,' § 2.

[6] See *E. Bib.*, 'Sethites,' § 2, where the two genealogies (the first conjecturally completed) are placed side by side.

Noaḥ or Naḥam, his supplanter in the deluge-story, was placed at the end of the second.'

'The reason why Enoch, alone among the Hebrew heroes, was raised to the rank of an individual whose fortunes were such as to mark him off from all the rest of mankind, is plain. It is not enough to point to the fact that the (conjectured) Hebrew root of Enoch (חנך) means "to train, instruct, initiate." The real reason probably is that the Enoch tribe was a branch of the Yeraḥme'elites, and, like the Yeraḥme'elites, had a high reputation for wisdom. From Ezek. xxviii. (see *Crit. Bib.* [and cp. above, p. 72]) we gather that "Yeraḥme'el" was supposed to have derived his wisdom from Elohim, in whose sacred garden he had dwelt; now from Ezek. xiv. 14, 20 we learn that Noaḥ (*i.e.* Enoch), Daniel (*i.e.* Yeraḥme'el), and Job (*i.e.* Arāb?) were classed together for their extraordinary righteousness. This exceptional goodness implies exceptional wisdom (cp. Enoch xlviii. 1). The first Yeraḥme'elite is commonly known to us as Adam (see however, p. 96), but it is very possible that this hero and demi-god was also in some sanctuaries spoken of as Enoch (Ḥanôk), and that his wisdom (cp. Job xv. 7 *f.*) was specially eulogised in the legend.'[1]

It only remains to notice that the 365 years of the life of Ḥanôk correspond to the 365 days (a solar year) which, according to 𝔊,[2] were the duration of the deluge. The explanation has been suggested above. Ḥanôk, as the hero of the deluge, was necessarily a solar personage (see p. 115). His translation corresponds to the disappearance (γενέσθαι ἀφανῆ) of Xisuthros and his companions in the Berossian tradition of the deluge, also to the poetic variant that the Babylonian hero Ut-napishtim was *taken* by Bel and made to dwell 'afar off, at the mouth of the streams'[3] (see p. 133). For the rest, see *E. Bib.*, 'Enoch,' and cp. Cheyne, *Origin of Psalter*, pp. 383, 392, 432.

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Sethites,' § 4.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Deluge,' § 12.

[3] See *ibid.* §§ 2, 17. In Enoch lxx., Enoch is said to have been placed in the earthly Paradise, which he finds already peopled with 'the first fathers and the righteous.'

Six textual corrections have now to be mentioned. Putting aside the other names in the genealogy (already dealt with on iv. 17-26), I call attention first to אדם, without the article (*vv.* 1-5; cp. p. 95). According to Hommel (*Exp. Times*, xiv. 107) the name must mean 'earth' (אדמה, only without the feminine ending), because 'man' comes third, under the title אנוש. He proposes to point, not אָדָם, but אֵדֹם, and suggests that the title, Benê Edom, or Edomites, indicated that they originated in mother earth. But a primeval hero called 'earth' is as improbable as one called 'man' (see above, p. 96). The right reading is surely אֵרֶם, just as אנוש should be אשמן = ישמעאל.

2. In *v.* 5 אשר־חי, 'which he lived,' has no parallel here or anywhere else, except in xxv. 7. In both passages it is a corruption of אשחור (a gloss on אדם or ארם); cp. on ii. 23, iii. 20.

3. In *v.* 29 נח should be חנוך (see above, p. 114). Similarly in Eth. Enoch lx. 1, 'Enoch' seems to be a misreading for 'Noaḥ.' This was in every way easy. The description of the birth of Noaḥ in Eth. Enoch cvi. suggests that in the Aggada of the time Noaḥ was assimilated to some extent to Enoch (Ḥanôk).

4-6. It is not, however, textual corruption which has brought about the much-worn forms, Shem, Ḥam, and Yepheth (*v.* 32). Referring for other views to the relevant articles in *E. Bib.*, and to Hommel, *Aufsätze u. Abhandl.* p. 317; *Grundriss*, p. 119, note 1, and (on Ḥam) to Winckler, *Arab.-sem.-or.* p. 21, I cannot think it rash to hold that שם, like שמן in עץ שמן, is a mutilated form of ישמן = ישמעאל,[1] and חם of ירחם = ירחמאל (cp. on Ps. lxxviii. 51, cv. 23), while יפת probably comes from יפלט (see on ix. 27). Thus Noaḥ-Ḥanôk represents Canaan, and Shem, Ham, and Yepheth two (for 'Shem' and 'Ḥam' are synonymous) cognate tribes which belonged to the region of Canaan. See, further, on vi. 10.

[1] Cp. the Phœnician name שמוכל, certainly not 'the name has carried' (Cooke, p. 71), but a combination of two forms of ישמעאל (see on 'Zebulun,' xxx. 20, and cp. בעלרם, on xvii. 5).

MARRIAGES OF DIVINE BEINGS (GEN. VI. 1-4)

MARRIAGES of divine with human beings. Shortening of human life. Meaning of 'Nephilim.'—We ask first, Who are the *benê hâ-elôhîm* (*v.* 2)? The phrase may merely mean 'members of the company of Elohim.'[1] It is, however, an unique narrative that we have before us, and the phrase may very possibly have an unique meaning. In the original form of the myth, divinities who were but preternatural animal-men, and whose home was in a very material heaven, may have been represented as descending to the earth, and begetting animal men like themselves. Precisely such beings are described in the 'legend of Kutha' (*KB* vi. 293)—'warriors with bodies of vultures, men with raven faces, the great gods begot them, and Tiâmat suckled them.' This may be taken to mean preternatural, magically gifted men, who could assume at will the forms of certain animals. Stories of sexual intercourse between gods and men in classical mythology need not be specially referred to here (cp. Plat. *Crat.* 33).

In a later stage of development the story presupposed in *vv.* 1-2 must have become a stumbling-block, and the wonder is that any part of it survived. We can imagine that people wondered greatly who these 'sons of the Elohim' could have been. And so arose the notion, attested only very late, *i.e.* in the revival of mythology, of a 'fall of the angels,' and of the birth and misdeeds of the giants. The story of the wicked giants, however, is not necessarily late. It is widespread in America. The Skidi Pawnees say, 'The men and the women were giants. They were wonderful; they were like gods; they could perform miracles; they

[1] Cp. W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel*, p. 388; *E. Bib.*, col. 4690*f.*

felt that they were just as good as any of the gods in the heavens.'[1] At the time of the flood, it is held that they were turned into stone. So the story in Eth. Enoch vi., xv. may have an older basis. Dr. Charles's learned notes require some supplementing. The rebel angels are called 'watchers'; clearly this term connects them with the planetary spirits,[2] who keep ceaseless 'watch.' Their chief is 'Azazel' (עזאזל), a name also found in Lev. xvi. 8, 10, 26, and certainly from ישמעאל (see p. 30). They descend upon Mount Hermon, *i.e.* not the northern but the southern Hermon (Ps. lxxxix. 13); the name comes not from √חרם, but from ירחמאל. How natural the story of the descent now becomes! Azazel is, of course, at home in the land where 'Yeraḥme'el' or 'Ishmael' is the divinity; he is, in fact, himself a form of this long-since deposed deity. Only, in this case development has taken the opposite course to that which issues in 'Michael' (see p. 60). Michael is the good Yeraḥme'el; Azazel the bad one, the apostate.

Next, as to the shortening of human life. This is referred to in *v.* 3, from which we shall presently learn that Yahweh was averse from the production of a semi-divine race upon earth. But how great the difficulties are, a glance at the differences of the commentators will show. Take, for instance, רוחי. What does this word mean here? Is it the spirit of life given by God to men (Dillm.)? Or does it mean the air-like substance of which the beings called Elohim consist, and of which (according to the story) human beings for a time partook (Wellh., Stade, Gunkel)? At any rate, the expression is by no means clear, and we have already found that רוח is sometimes a corruption of ירח', *i.e.* ירחמאל (see on i. 2 *b*, iii. 8, Isa. xlviii. 16), and that the original story of creation had reference to the first Yeraḥ-me'elites. A more natural interpretation, as it seems to me, is produced if we suppose the semi-divine origin of the Yeraḥme'elites to be here referred to, and render, 'Yeraḥ-

[1] Dorsey, *Pawnee Traditions*, pp. 333, 338.

[2] Note especially the name Kokabiel, and cp. Epiphan. *Haer.* xvi. 2, where the planet Jupiter is called the Κωκεβ Βααλ (Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 34, note 2).

me'el (*i.e.* the race so-called) shall not,' etc. Thus the subject of the verb in *v.* 3 *a*, and the implied subject in *v.* 3 *b*, are the same, which is, grammatically, a gain.

But what, more exactly, is the statement respecting Yerahme'el? The text has לא־ידון רוחי וגו׳, but the note in *BDB* (*s.v.* דין) will probably convince most readers that ידון is incorrect. Winckler's comparison of Ass. *danânu*, 'to be mighty,' is far-fetched, and hardly satisfactory. Perhaps, however, 𝔊's *οὐ μὴ καταμείνῃ* may help us.[1] The underlying verb may be יכון, or, more suitably, יאריך (Num. ix. 19, 22), or, better, יעמוד. באדם, of course, goes with the verb; so also does רוחי, רוח being sometimes masculine. But is רוחי correct? הוא בשר in the next clause may seem to favour it—'spirit' and 'flesh' form a natural antithesis. We have seen, however (on i. 2, iii. 8), that רוח may sometimes have come from ירחמאל, and we know that Yerahme'el (the second member of the Israelite duad) was the god closely concerned with earthly, and specially Arabian, affairs Thus we get as the opening of *v.* 3, 'And Yahweh said, Not for ever shall Yerahme'el abide in man.'

Now comes the greatest *crux* of all—בְּשַׁגָּם, for which *BDB* gives 'by reason of their going astray.' This, however, carries respect for MT. too far; the supposed sense would not have been so expressed, and Geiger, Baer, and Ginsburg prefer the reading בָּשָׂגַם, which is also that of the Versions. Shall we, then, adopt בְּשַׁגַּם? But what Hebrew writer would have used this prosaic phrase?[2] Hommel suggests 'nach Vielheiten,' a gloss on בשר, which is to mean 'nach Saren.'[3] This scholar rightly sees that a new path is required, but misses the right one. *BDB* has already compared the personal name אבישג. This name, however, does not mean 'my father is a warrior' (*BDB*, with ?), but 'Arabia of Ishmael'; 'Abishag' should be 'Abishan'; שן, like שונם,[4] comes from ישמן = ישמעאל. Similarly, בשגם should rather be בשמן, *i.e.* בישמ׳ (cp. on Judg. iii. 29, Isa. x. 27). It is a gloss on באדם. Not the whole human

[1] The rest of 𝔊 agrees with MT.
[2] See Wellh. *CH*, p. 307; Holz. *ad loc.*
[3] See his own explanation, *Gr.* p. 183, note 1.
[4] 'Abishag' is called 'a Shunammite' (1 K. i. 3).

race is intended, but the Ishmaelite or Yeraḥme'elite people on the N. Arabian border of Palestine.

Next as to הוּא בָשָׂר. It will now be plain that 'he is (only) flesh' (*i.e.* 'a weak, earthly creature') cannot be right. הוא at once suggests that בשר may be a gloss, and if so, it is of course mispointed. In 1 S. xxx. 9, etc., we meet with הבשור, which most probably comes from ערב־שחור. So בשר here probably comes from עֶרֶב־שֻׁר (cp. on Ex. xxxi. 2); 'Shur' and 'Shiḥor' are shortened and adapted forms of 'Asshur' or 'Ashḥur,' one of the names for the whole or a part of the Arabian border-land (cp. on xvi. 7). Thus *v.* 2 becomes, 'And Yahweh said, Yeraḥme'el shall not abide for ever among men [in Ishmael, that is, Arab-Asshur]; his days shall be (only) one hundred and twenty years.'

Prof. Sievers makes the astonishing suggestion that *v.* 3 *c* may be a gloss based on xxiii. 1 (Sarah died at 127), as if the glossator thought that the age of the 'daughters of men' were referred to. Probably, 120 is given as the ideal age for the close of a human life (like 110 in Egypt).

Lastly, we have to consider the 'Nephilim.' A notice in *v.* 4 states that the 'Nephilim,' who survived into the Israelitish period, arose when the above strange marriages took place. Thus the first Nephilim were the children of 'benê hā-elōhīm' by earthly mothers. The glosses show that the statement was not felt to be perfectly clear. Let us first of all consider הנפלים. The article, of course, indicates that the term is a well-known one. In fact, from Num. xiii. 33 we learn that when the Israelites entered Canaan they found the Nephilim there, and a gloss says that they were the 'sons of 'Anaḳ'; now ענך is most probably a corrupt form of עמלק, *i.e.* ירחמאל. The 'Niphlîtes,' as we may call them, were therefore, at any rate, a section of the widely spread Yeraḥme'elite race.

Further, in Ezek. xxxii. 27, in the phrase את־גבורים נפלים מערלים, the two latter words obviously represent נפלים ירחמאלים, a double gloss on גבורים. It is true, 𝔊, with its *ἀπὸ αἰῶνος*, presupposes the reading מעולם. But עולם (see on xxi. 33) as well as ערלים (see on Judg. xiv. 3) is a current corruption of ירחמאל; a reduplicated מ is an

ordinary phenomenon. נפלים, then, is at any rate a synonym of ירחמאלים.

The same result follows from Judg. vii. 12, viii. 10, where נפלים[ה] is plainly a gloss on בני רקם (so read), 'sons of Reḳem,' *i.e.* Yeraḥme'elites, and from Gen. xxv. 18 (see note), where it is said of the Ishmaelites that they dwelt eastward of a region called by some name which underlies אחיו נפל. Now אחיו, as experience enables us to decide, is אשחור; נפל therefore must be the name of some district closely connected with Ashḥur.

Some critics have asserted the existence of a somewhat too scrupulous glossator, who felt bound to remark that Nephilim were in existence 'afterwards also' (cp. Num. xiii. 33). The view is quite erroneous. First, as to the reading אחרי. This word (or, what is practically the same thing, אחר) is so often a corruption of אשחור or אשחר that when it occurs in a suspicious passage we may reasonably correct it into one or the other of these words. Let us also remember that בשגם has already turned out to be a corruption of בישמן (= 'in Ishmael'), and this—if אחרי comes from אשחור—at once suggests to us that וגם must have come from ימן (see on יון, x. 2). The compound name ימן אשחור, *i.e.* Yaman-Ashḥur, is a very suitable gloss on בארץ. כן is probably a redactional expansion of כ, which should properly be taken with אשר, *i.e.* we should read כַּאֲשֶׁר. Thus we get for the first part of *v.* 4, 'The Niphlites were (or arose) in those days in the land [Yaman-Ashḥur], when the sons of Ha-elohim,' etc.

The closing words of *v.* 4 have also to be restored, if possible, to their true form. Evidently they ought to be explanatory. But what we now read, 'they are the primeval heroes, the men of renown,' is no explanation at all. Dillmann indeed informs us that the writer substitutes the ordinary and intelligible word גברים for the antiquated and unintelligible נפלים; but if the terms are synonymous, why did he add anything? And if he was bent on a supplement, why did he make such a poor one? Of course, the נ׳ were 'primeval'; of course, they were 'renowned'—any one could guess that. Now it so happens that the same qualification, אשר מעולם, occurs in a geographical note

in 1 S. xxvii. 8 (see note), where the words have arisen out of אשר מירחמאל; and a parallel case in Ezekiel has been referred to above in another connexion. Read therefore, 'they are the heroes who sprang from Yerahme'el' (אשר מירח'), which is the first part of a gloss on the ethnic term הנפלים. Two words only remain, which are co-ordinated with אשר מעולם; these are אנשי השם. Clearly this is too vague to be correct. The phrase occurs again (only without the article) in the MT. of Num. xvi. 2, where it is used of the partisans of Korah, and where the original text probably had אנשי ישמעאל. Here, too, we may safely correct אנשי ישמ', 'men of Ishmael,' which is a suitable alternative gloss on the obscure נפלים.

We are now in a better position to consider the probable origin of נפלים. It is no doubt an ethnic, and it is impossible that the traces of the existence of that ethnic should be limited to Gen. vi. 4 and Num. xiii. 33. It is true, there are other traces which are not clearly visible in the MT.; most of these have been mentioned above. From the passages in which they occur we gather that 'Niphlite' and 'Yerahme'elite' or 'Ishmaelite' are synonymous, and that נפל might be combined with אשחור. Is there any widely attested name of a tribe or district out of which נפל may have arisen? There is; Lapana in *Am. Tab.* (see on xxv. 18), Laban, Libnah, Lebanon, all bear witness to the existence of a widespread Laban or Laphan tribe, and we even find in one of the traditional David-narratives a personal name which we can hardly help grouping with Nephilim and with Laban, viz. the name of Abigail's first husband, Nabal (1 S. xxv. 3). I take it, therefore, that the name of the ancient warlike tribe, which traced its origin to the inferior gods, or demi-gods, might equally well be called Naphal and Laphan, Nabal and Laban, and that its original seats were in the Arabian border-land. This is a sufficiently illuminative result, even without our venturing to say what Naphal or Laphan originally meant. See, further, on x. 8, 9, also on xxxii. 31 (Penuel, a development of נפל).

THE SECOND AGE OF THE WORLD, BEGINNING WITH THE DELUGE (GEN. vi. 5–xi. 27-32).

CHAP. vi. 5-ix. 17 (J, P). The Deluge. Although vi. 1-4 is given by J as the introduction to the deluge-story, yet the tale of the marriages (*vv.* 1, 2) is quite distinct in its origin. The Babylonian deluge-story has no such introduction; the legend of Kutha (quoted above), though mythological, has no cosmogonic connexion. At the same time, we must remember that the Babylonian deluge-stories, however ancient, are, upon the whole, not primitive. And it is permissible to refer to a N. American (Skidi Pawnee) myth, which, though it also is not quite primitive, yet contains some archaic details. Among these is the statement that the deluge was sent by the heaven-god to destroy the wicked giants and the monstrous animals on the first earth.[1] It is therefore a tenable view that Gen. vi. 1, 2, in an expanded form, was originally the introduction to a Hebrew deluge-story, no longer extant.

The notion of a disharmony between the heavenly Beings—implied in *vv.* 1-3—is also very archaic. The germs of dualism abound in the N. American creation and flood stories, and in the Babylonian cosmogony they have grown up into an elaborate dragon-myth. Not so, indeed, in the deluge-story. But it may be questioned whether the preternatural serpents who were connected with the subterranean waters did not play a most important part in the primitive story out of which at length our present deluge-story developed. One of those races which retained the primitive spirit for ages after its departure or decay elsewhere—the Algonkins of N. America—represented the

[1] Dorsey, *Skidi Pawnee Traditions* (1894), p. 23.

flood as produced, not by a creator, but by the serpents, whose prince Michabazo (the theriomorphic creator of the earth and of men)[1] had mortally wounded. Michabazo was hotly pursued by his enemies (cp. 'the helpers of Rahab,' Job ix. 13), but got safely to the top of the highest tree on the highest hill. There he saw that the subterranean waters were also after him; he only just escaped. After the subsidence of the flood he proceeded to remake the earth. Divers animals (including a raven) play the same part of assistants as at the creation. Last of all, aided by the badger, Michabazo obtained the mastery over the serpents.[2]

Let no one despise 'the day of small things.' The tale has not indeed the epic grandeur of the Babylonian story, or the sober simplicity of the Hebrew; but it helps one to realise how far the human spirit has had to travel from its childish beginnings. Michabazo is in one aspect a creator, in another a Herakles or a Gilgamesh, whose business it is, not without risks, to clear the earth from monsters. The earth-maker being theriomorphic, his opponents must be so too. In a late stage of this flood-story a moral element appears; the flood is caused by the 'mighty snake' the evil Manitu.[3] Dualism has developed.

It is possible, therefore, that the deluge was originally thought to have been caused by the malice of the serpents, who saw with displeasure the orderliness of the world. Both in the Algonkin, and especially in the Skidi Pawnee and Caingang (Brazilian) myth,[4] the part played by birds reminds one of the Babylonian and Hebrew stories. This

[1] *I.e.* of America and its tribes. Father Hennepin long ago remarked that these tribes 'believe that the Europeans do inhabit another world different from theirs' (*A New Discovery of a vast Country in America*, Lond. 1698, p. 49 (continuation)).

[2] Brinton, *Myths of the New World*, pp. 176 *ff.*

[3] Brinton, *The Lenâpe and their Legends* (*the Walam Olum*), 1885.

[4] The Skidi Pawnee have the three birds, including the raven (Dorsey). The Caingang tribe finely describe the state of the survivors on a mountain, expecting to die, 'when they heard the song of the *saracura* birds, who came carrying earth in baskets, and threw it into the waters, which slowly subsided' (*American Folklore*, xviii. 223 *ff.*). Mud is the creator's usual material.

highly primitive form of representation suggests two points of capital importance: (1) that the chief actor in the scene was originally a bird-man (for his assistants would be like himself), and (2) that the deluge originally led on to a second creation of the world (the olive-leaf, or the branch of fir in the Tinné story, which the dove brings in its beak, is a substitute for the morsel of moist clay out of which the more primitive myths say that the earth was created).[1]

In these primitive stories the second creation implies the imperfection of the first; the creator could not at once have declared that all that he had made was 'very good' (Gen. i. 31), nor could his opponent Ahriman, in the Parsee Genesis, have spontaneously 'commended the creatures and creation' of the All-knowing Lord (*Bund.* i. 12). The acquired imperfection of the first creation is indeed implied in the pessimistic statement of Gen. iii. 17, 'cursed is the ground for thy sake.' But it was at least a tolerable imperfection, and even J (to whose school Gen. iii. 17 is due) did not venture to make the deluge in all respects a turning-point in earthly destinies. In this connexion the Guatemala myth is noteworthy. The divine creators of men did not all at once succeed; so the gods destroyed these 'mannikins' by a flood. Afterwards they succeeded too well, and had to abstract a few qualities from these perfect creatures, so producing normal men, the ancestors of the Quichés.[2] Here, as elsewhere, the Deity is unwilling that earthly men should be too nearly divine. And yet, for nothing less than this is the inward longing of normal men, and later Jewish and Iranian speculation, adopting the theory of world-ages, produced the grand idea of a future restoration of Paradise, a 'frashôkereti' or renovation of the world.[3]

We have by no means exhausted the suggestions of the American myths. According to one form of the Tlinkît myth (N.W. America), their raven-hero, who is a half-developed creator and the producer of the flood, recommended those who survived the flood to throw stones

[1] So Stucken. [2] *Popol Vuh*, cap. iii. (Stucken and Andree).
[3] De Harlez, *Avesta*, introd. p. clxxxv.

behind them, upon which a new human race would arise.[1] How, indeed, could the wonderful increase of mankind be otherwise explained? The Tamanaks on the Orinoco have a similar flood-story; here, however, the kernels of fruit-stones stand instead of ordinary stones. The Deucalion flood-story and the Lithuanian[2] agree with the Tlinkît. Surely this notion is highly primitive; it springs from a time when, not only between gods, men, and animals, but between organised and unorganised life, there was no sharp distinction, the same breath of divinity pervading it all (cp. Dorsey, *Pawnee Traditions*, pp. 105, 260, 346). Matt. iii. 9 is, of course, not on the same plane of thought; here it is only by God's all-mightiness that children can be raised up to Abraham. But the form of expression ('children out of stones') may have come down from the time when the world was young and men still perfectly naïve.

As a rule, the heroes of these flood-stories do not themselves foresee the flood; it is sometimes a friendly animal who warns them. But in the flood-story of the Hare Indians it is the hero himself who foresees the calamity; his name is fitly called Kunyan 'the intelligent.'[3] We may compare the Babylonian hero Atra-ḫasis and the Hebrew Noaḥ (Enoch?) who 'walked with Elohim,' though the parallel is not quite complete, since both these had divine warnings.

As to the cause of the deluge, we have seen that it was sometimes the discontent of the earth-producer with his work, sometimes the enmity of the serpents. Another cause, however, is mentioned in a Gippsland story. 'Some children of the Kurnai, in playing about, found a turndun (bull-roarer), which they took home to the camp, and showed the women. Immediately the earth crumbled away, and it was all water, and the Kurnai were drowned. Mungun left the earth, and ascended to the sky, where he still remains.'[4] The desecration of a holy mystery, *i.e.* the

[1] Ratzel, *Hist. of Mankind*, ii. 148. Yelch's own father was a pebble.

[2] See Stucken, *Astr.-mythen*, pp. 282 *f.*

[3] Petitot, *Traditions Indiennes du Canada Nord-ouest*, pp. 147 *f.*; in Stucken, p. 285.

[4] Howitt, in Lang, *Custom and Myth*, p. 35; *The Making of Religion*, p. 196.

breaking of a taboo (as in Paradise), is one of the most natural causes of such an event.

But Polynesian stories tell us much more than this. When Ruahatu, the god of the sea, forgives the penitent fisherman for an involuntary breach of taboo, he bids him take wife and child, with a single friend, and domestic animals, and flee to Toamarama. Now Toamarama, the name of a neighbouring islet, means 'tree of the moon,' alluding to a mythic tree which grew up to the sky. But the god would take his revenge. As the sun approached the horizon, the flood rose, and destroyed all, except these on Toamarama. The escaped fisherman became the progenitor of a new race.[1] Three other clearly mythical names may be mentioned besides Toamarama. One is Pito-hiti ('the navel of . . .'), the name of a mountain on Tahiti. The other two are 'flood of the moon,' and 'flood of the eye of light' (*i.e.* the sun), names of the deluge in Hawaii and in New Zealand respectively. It appears as if to the happy Polynesians the sky appeared like a great blue sea, and the sun, moon, and stars (or constellations) like a man and his wife, with their children, or sometimes like boats carrying living beings (cp. Egypt).[2]

The most famous of the Greek flood-stories is that of Deucalion, son of Prometheus, and father of Hellen.[3] It is represented as a local flood, but this is because to primitive myth-makers their own land is virtually the earth. The story appears late in literature, but must have come from a primitive deluge-myth, as is shown by the mention of the chest, the mountain of landing, the sacrifice, and, last not least, the incident (see above) of the 'getting themselves without marriage-bed a race from stones' (Pind. *Ol.* ix. 44). Lucian's account, however, in *De deâ Syr.* xii. xiii., is a mere version of the Babylonian story. He mentions as the reputed founder of the temple at Bambyke (Hierapolis) Deucalion-Sisythes,[4] where Sisythes is of course the Xisuthros

[1] Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, ii. 58 *f.*
[2] Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie*, vi. 270, 272.
[3] Cp. Usener, *op. cit.* pp. 51 *ff.*
[4] Buttmann's correction, τὸν Σισυθέα for τὸν Σκύθεα.

of Berossus. The water of the deluge flowed away through a cleft in the earth under the temple.

Was there, we may ask, any deluge-story in Egypt? Most (*e.g.* Dillmann, Gunkel, Driver) answer in the negative. Yet the Egyptian priests told Solon that there had been not one but many floods, and the mythic basis of the Egyptian cosmogony is equally valid for an Egyptian deluge. If in far-distant ages the waters of the abyss enveloped the germs of all things, how likely it was that at a later period of mythic history the same waters should have made an irruption into the ordered world! The serpent Apepi and the other monsters were always lying in wait for the god Ra (Re) as he sailed in his solar bark on the celestial ocean; may not the waters of the abyss have now and again aided the assailants, just as Sît, with whom Apepi is virtually one, overcame Osiris? And the 'Book of the Dead' actually contains such a flood-story. Here is a passage from it: 'And further, I am going to deface all I have done; this earth will become water (or, an ocean) through an inundation, as it was at the beginning.' No mention is made of the destruction of men, but the text of the chapter is not preserved in full. After the great flood we are told that Osiris was established, not without a struggle, as king in Heracleopolis.[1] We also hear of a catastrophe called the destruction of mankind. Ra, the divine king of the earth, being disgusted at human insolence, resolved to exterminate men. A massacre ensued, after which, to provide a secure abode for the aged king, the work of creation was completed by the separation of earth and sky (cp. the parallel New Zealand myth).[2]

The Phrygian myth is unimportant, because it has been mixed up with the Jewish. For this the large Jewish colonies in Asia Minor are responsible. Thus Apamea (Kibotos) adopted the Noah-story; Iconium that of Enoch, whose name was connected with the Phrygian name of Ναννακος or Αννακος. This king was said to

[1] See Naville, *PSBA*, 1904, pp. 250 *ff.*, 287 *ff.*

[2] See Maspero, *Dawn of Civilisation*, pp. 164-168; Stucken, *Astralmythen*, pp. 119-123.

have lived more than three hundred years, and to have foretold the deluge.[1]

Had the Iranians a deluge-myth? We learn from the Parsee Genesis (*Bund.* chap. vii.) that in the second conflict between the good and evil creations the star Tîstar (Sirius) produced a mighty flood. Its object was to destroy the noxious creatures on the as yet unpeopled earth, and it lasted thirty days and thirty nights. The interesting story of Yima's Paradise (cp. p. 14) has also been converted by late systematisers into a deluge-story. The Vara, or enclosure, constructed by Yima, was regarded by them as designed to preserve specimens of living beings from a deluge, after the subsidence of which the inhabitants of the Vara would come forth, and arrange a better world. But in the original, which is distinguished by its metrical character, the calamity to be avoided is, not a flood, but a dire winter at the end of the world.[2]

The Indian story exists in several forms. The earliest is that in the Ṣatapatha Brahmana. It is stated here that Manu, the first man, the son of the sun-god Vivasvant, found one day, in bathing, a small fish, which asked for tendance, and promised in return to deliver Manu in the flood that should come. The fish grew to such a size that it had to be carried to the sea, where it revealed to Manu the time of the flood, and bade him make a ship. This was done, and Manu (alone) embarked. His vessel was towed by the supernatural fish (to whose horn it was fastened) to the summit of the northern mountain, where, at the command of the fish, Manu bound it to a tree. As the waters sank, Manu came down; he then sacrificed and prayed. At the end of a year his prayer was granted: he saw before him a woman, who called herself his daughter Iḍâ (goddess of fertility). No mention is here made of sin as the cause of the flood. In the Mahâbhârata a fuller account is given.

[1] See Pilcher, *PSBA* xxv. (1903), 225-233; Cheyne, *E. Bib.*, col. 1066; and Usener, *Die Sintfluthsagen*, p. 48, note 3; the two latter for references.

[2] See Geldner, in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, xxv. 179 *ff.*; and cp. Darmesteter's note, *SBE* iv. 16. Stucken (p. 95) has failed to observe this.

Here Manu is accompanied by the seven 'rishis,' doubtless in order that the religious tradition may be handed on. Seeds are also taken in the ship. The mystery of the horned fish, too, finds its explanation. He is the god Brahmā, and communicates to Manu the power of creating both gods and men. This flood is said to have lasted many years. A third account, that in the Bhâgavata Purâna, is very late and of a composite character; Jewish influence can be detected.

The Babylonian story exists in two principal forms, which are the local traditions of Sippar and Shurippak[1] respectively. The hero of the former is called Xisuthros, a Greek contraction of Ḫasis-atra = Atra-ḫasis, 'the very wise,' a title of the favoured man in the Gilgamesh epic (xi. 196). Warned in a dream by Kronos (Bel), he built a ship and embarked, accompanied by wife, daughter, friends, and steersman. He also took with him quadrupeds and birds. When asked whither he went, he was bidden to answer, 'To the gods, to pray for good things for men.' How long the flood lasted, we are not told. On its cessation he sent out some of the birds, three separate times. The first time they returned; also the second time, with muddied feet; the third time they failed to return. Seeing that the ship had grounded on a certain mountain, Xisuthros now disembarked with his wife and daughter, and the steersman, and sacrificed, after which he and his companions disappeared. Those who had remained on the ship now in their turn disembarked, and called him by name. But a voice from heaven admonished them to fear God; Xisuthros himself, because of his piety, had gone to dwell with the gods, and this honour was shared by his companions. They themselves were bidden to return to Babylon, to take up the writings deposited by Xisuthros at Sippar, and to distribute these among men. The land in which they then were was Armenia.

I have given this at some length because the Berossian account seems to have been somewhat neglected. Six

[1] Prof. F. C. Burkitt identifies Shurippak (a place on the Euphrates) with Sarbog, which occurs in a Syriac hymn (*Journ. of Theol. Studies*, Oct. 1902); so also G. Hoffmann (according to Jensen, *KB* vi. 481, who opposes this view).

points of importance have to be noticed. (1) Bel, not Ea, gives warning of the deluge. The other flood-story is 'a glorification of Ea at the expense of Bel' (Jastrow). (2) The whole of mankind (*i.e.* at any rate all Babylonia), not merely a particular city, is to be overwhelmed. (3) The hero of the deluge is the tenth of the Babylonian kings who are mentioned by this writer. (4) The hero himself anticipates his apotheosis. (5) The birds return the second time with mud on their feet—a faint trace of a detail found in several archaic N. American stories, viz. that a morsel of mud is brought back by a bird for the use of the earth-former (see p. 126). (6) In the time of Berossus (*c.* 280 B.C.) the mountain on which the ark grounded was supposed to be in Armenia. (7) The authority for the fundamentals of Babylonian hierology (set forth in 'the writings') is said to date back to the times before the deluge. Cp. the seven 'rishis' who accompanied Manu. Possibly enough a similar statement (now lost) was made respecting the sacred lore of the Israelites. In Enoch lxxii. 1, Methu-selah is commanded to 'preserve the books from his father's hands and commit them to the generations of the world.' In this part of Genesis, however, the only revelation expressly mentioned is that in chap. ix.

The setting given to the deluge-story in Berossos is therefore of special interest. Xisuthros closes the age of primitive revelations. He is one of those 'old sages' to whose utterances later hierologists appeal as their authorities.[1] He is also a king, for perfect wisdom is the characteristic of kings (Prov. viii. 15). In fact, he and his predecessors correspond to the king of the divine city, which we must, I think, postulate on the summit of the mountain of Elohim spoken of in Ezek. xxviii. 12 *ff.* Doubtless Xisuthros is represented by Berossos as king of Babylon, but so too, we may observe, the demi-god of Ezek. xxviii. must have been represented by Yerahme'elite writers as king of Miṣṣor, and it may be of this hero that Jewish writers are thinking when they describe the ideal king of the future.[2]

[1] Zimmern, *KAT*, p. 537.

[2] See Isa. xi. 1-9, noting the reference to restored Paradise.

A very different setting is given to the deluge-story in the Gilgamesh epic. The hero called Gilgamesh has taken a long and difficult journey to find his ancestor Ut-napishtim, and on his arrival asks this personage how he found entrance into 'the assembly of the gods' and 'sought life.' To which Ut-napishtim replies :—

> I will open to thee, O Gilgamesh ! a secret thing,
> And the decision of the gods will I tell thee.

He then gives an elaborate, poetical description of the deluge, which has been so often repeated that I may assume it to be well known.

There are, however, several points of detail which deserve attention. Thus, Ut-napishtim is evidently a plain citizen of Shurippak ; how, indeed, should a king of Babylon dwell at Shurippak ? But his personal importance is not slight ; he is both rich and pious, and closely connected with the god Ea, just as his father Ubar-tutu is with Ea's son, Marduk (Tutu = Marduk). Ea, supported by Ishtar, is the patron of humanity ; but other gods, notably Bel, are hostile to mankind. It is Ea (not Bel, as in Berossus) who warns Ut-napishtim in a dream, and tells him to build a ship (*elippu*), meaning perhaps a flat-bottomed skiff with upturned edges, such as is still used on the Euphrates. Its dimensions are to be carefully planned, and Ut-napishtim is further directed to take 'seeds of a living being of all kinds.' The 'Very Wise' interprets these commands intelligently, not forgetting to take a store of bitumen (*kupru*, *iddu*) in case of needful repairs. After a feast, he puts on board all his silver and gold (going beyond his orders), his whole household, cattle, and wild beasts (grass-eaters, as an independent document states), also skilled artificers, to restore the old civilisation. A sign is given to him that he may embark and shut the door. A striking polytheistic passage follows, describing the storm-flood (*abubu*) ; the gods who took no part in it 'cowered like dogs' and 'went up to the heaven of Anu.' Six days and nights the storm-flood lasts ; then a calm sets in. Ut-napishtim opens the air-hole (window), and sadly surveys the scene. After twelve (double hours ?) the vessel grounds

on the mountain of Niṣir.[1] There it remains six full days. On the morning of the seventh day Ut-napishtim sends out at intervals a dove, a swallow, and a raven. The first two return, but not the third—a signal for Ut-napishtim to leave the ship. Then he offers a sacrificial victim and incense, to the boundless delight of the minor gods.

> The gods inhaled the odour,
> The gods inhaled the sweet odour,
> The gods gathered like flies about the sacrificer.[2]

After a dispute with some of the other gods, Bel becomes reconciled. This is how he blesses Ut-napishtim and his wife :—

> Formerly Ut-napishtim was a man ;
> Now shall Ut-napishtim and his wife be accounted like us, the gods.
> Ut-napishtim shall dwell afar off, at the mouth of the streams.

'Then,' the hero adds, 'they brought me afar off ; at the mouth of the streams they caused me to dwell.'

We now see the significance of the hero's name, Ut-napishtim, *i.e.* 'he saw (or found) life.' It was the mighty word of Bel which changed him from human to divine. True, this was supplemented by translation. He was taken to a distant spot, where, as it seems, the gods sometimes assembled ; it is obscurely described here as 'at the mouth of the streams.' Here there was water which could make the sick whole, and a magic plant, difficult to get, which could make the old young, but no park of wonderful trees such as Gilgamesh found at an earlier point. Where, the prosaic reader may ask, was this highly favoured place situated ?

One may first of all think of the two cuneiform passages[3] in which the phrase 'the mouth of the streams' means the district where the Euphrates and the Tigris join the Persian

[1] Jensen also suggests the reading Nimush or Nimus (*Das Gilg. Epos*, p. 43, note 2). He thinks too (p. 45) that Berossus put the mountain in the neighbourhood of the Jebel Jūdī. Sayce (*Exp. Times*, Nov. 1906, p. 72, note 1) seems to place Niṣir here.

[2] The minor gods seem not much respected by the poet. Contrast Gen. viii. 21 (J), which is quite naïvely expressed.

[3] Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 213.

Gulf, and in one of which Eridu (the city sacred to Ea) is also mentioned. But surely an island opposite Eridu can hardly be intended here;[1] the god Bel emphatically says that the place is far away, and Gilgamesh (who goes to visit Ut-napishtim) gives a thrilling account of the perils of his journey. Let us take a hint from Enoch. When this personage says (Eth. Enoch xvii. 10) that he saw 'the mouths of all the rivers of the earth and the mouth of the deep,' he means the mythical ocean-stream which surrounds the earth, and receives all its rivers and seas. So, too, Bel must surely mean a spot at the 'end of the earth,' on the ocean-stream. Was it Socotra, an island on the coast of S. Arabia, supposed to be that referred to in the Egyptian tale of the shipwrecked mariner, translated by Maspero? This view has been advanced by Hommel.[2] Jensen, however, is of opinion[3] that even S. Arabia is not sufficiently distant, and that some land or island in the far west is meant. He thinks that the phrase 'the mouth of the streams' was perhaps suggested by the Straits of Gibraltar, and further reminds us of 'Elishah' in Gen. x. 4, which is mentioned together with 'Tarshish' (S. Spain?), and, according to him, means N.W. Africa,[4] and is connected with the mythic name Elysium.

Certainly it is plausible enough to suppose that the translated Ut-napishtim dwelt in an Elysium in the far west like that of the Aryan peoples and like the Egyptian Amenti. But Hommel's view is not in itself impossible. The southern ocean may quite conceivably be intended. Arabia was much more real to the early Babylonians than the far west, and if Hommel is correct,[5] they sometimes

[1] In *KB* vi. 481, *Das Gilg. Epos*, i. 40, note 1, Jensen expresses the opinion that Ut-napishtim, the favourite of Ea, must reside in Ea's city, so that Shurippak would be a name either for Eridu, or at least for a part of Eridu. If so, Jensen's older view, though widely held, is out of the question.

[2] *AHT*, pp. 35 *f.* The 'waters of death' in the epic may, he thinks, be in the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb, where, in fact, there are numerous islands. Against Hommel, see Bertholet, *Die Gefilde der Seligen* (1903), pp. 17 *f.*

[3] *KB* vi. 506 *f.*; *Das Gilg. Epos*, p. 33.

[4] Against this view, see on Gen. x.

[5] *Gr.* pp. 11, 256.

(alluding to its frankincense) even called the whole of Arabia the 'land of God.' A third view, however, deserves careful consideration. It is clearly implied in the Gilgamesh epic that Ut-napishtim was admitted to the assembly (*puḫru*) of the gods. Why may not heroes like this Babylonian Enoch, who escaped death, have had (according to the earlier view) a mansion on the mountain of the gods (p. 72)? It is true the phrase 'at the mouth of the streams' points to a residence on some ocean-island. But inconsistent statements, belonging to different ages and writers, ought not to surprise us. Gilgamesh himself, as the deputy of Shamash,[1] must also have joined the divine assembly.

It is one of the most striking differences between the story in Genesis and that in the Gilgamesh epic that whereas, in the latter, the hero of the deluge passes away alive from the world of toiling mortals, in the former he becomes the head of the second human race. If, however, my contention is justified, and 'Noaḥ' is really miswritten for 'Ḥanôk,' there must have been a time when the Canaanite or Yeraḥme'elite deluge-story closed with the statement that the God Yeraḥme'el took this wise and righteous man to the mountain of the Divine Beings.

Do the two stories also differ as regards the mountain where the ark or boat grounded? The epic tells us that it was the mountain of Niṣir; a land or mountain so called is, in fact, referred to in the inscriptions. It appears that this Niṣir lay in Media, east of the Lower Zab. Berossus, however, asserts that the unnamed mountain was in Armenia.[2] And what says the Priestly Writer (P) in Genesis? He tells us that 'the ark rested . . . on the mountains of Ararat' (Gen. viii. 4). Does 'Ararat' here mean Armenia? We may, indeed, plausibly connect it with Urarṭu, a region which forms part of the modern Armenia. Niṣir, however, is not in Urarṭu. Is it certain, then, that 'Ararat' really stood in the writing from which P draws? We shall have to return to this question a little later.

J and P also differ. Note, *e.g.*, the non-mention in J

[1] See the hymn in *KB* vi. 267.

[2] For Jensen's and Sayce's views, see p. 135, note 1.

of the rainbow (see ix. 12-16, P). This non-mention is specially strange, because the words 'I do set my bow in the cloud' (cp. Ezek. i. 28), from their mythical appearance, would be expected in the older narrative. We must remember, however, (1) that late writings often contain very primitive details, and (2) that the origin of the rainbow finds no place in the Babylonian creation-epic. In what may possibly be a fragment of that epic (*KB* vi. 33) we do indeed find the bow of Marduk referred to. Anu and the other gods, we are told, admired this bow, and the former appointed as its third name 'Bow-(star).'[1] One can understand that war-gods like Marduk in Babylonia, Ḳuzaḥ in Arabia,[2] Yahweh in Canaan (Ps. lxxvii. 18, Heb. iii. 9), and Indra in India should have bows, and that when the battle was over, the bow should be hung up in the sky. But it is surely Sirius, and not the rainbow, to which such myths refer.[3] Nor is there any suggestion in P's deluge-story that Yahweh has been shooting his arrows. Indeed, the rainbow seems to be created at the end of the deluge as a symbol of Yahweh's pledge that he will not cause another similar catastrophe. The Greek Iris is really nearer to the 'bow in the cloud'—Iris, who is the interpreter of the divine counsels. The notion that the rainbow is the bridge[4] (Edda) or path[5] (Tahitian myth) of the gods lies further off. Nor is it important to quote the Lithuanian deluge-story (see p. 127), in which the rainbow appears as a comforter and counsellor of the survivors from the deluge.

The accounts also differ as to the duration of the flood. P makes it 365 days, *i.e.* a solar year (cp. Enoch's age, v. 23), while J, if the text may be accepted, made it forty days and nights—the time of the Pleiades,—after which he

[1] It is true Ishtar (as the goddess of war) is, properly speaking, the divinity of the Bow-star. See *KAT*(3), p. 426.

[2] Passages from the *Hamāsa*, etc., in Tuch, *ZDMG*, 1849, pp. 200 *f.*; cp. Hommel, *Gr.* p. 165.

[3] Cp. Job xxxviii. 36, where for מחוה we should read תוחה, or rather תרחה, 'the lance-star,' and, for שכוי, קשת, 'the bow-(star).' See Cheyne, *JBL*, 1898, pp. 104 *f.*

[4] Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, pp. 694, 696.

[5] Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie*, vi. 268.

allows two periods of seven days before the patriarch leaves the ark. The epic gives only seven days for the duration of the flood, after which the ship remains six full days on the mountain of Niṣir (see above). It is possible that in an older form of the Babylonian story the deluge may have been made to last 365 days; P may represent a much more archaic tradition than even the Babylonian epic. Whether the Hebrew term תֵּבָה, 'chest' (= 'ark'), is, or is not, more ancient than the Babylonian *elippu*, 'ship,' is a question which may be variously answered.

It is needless to compare the several accounts more fully. The task has been accomplished by my predecessors.[1] Nor need I spend time on bringing out the wide difference between the religious spirit of the Babylonian and that of the Hebrew narratives. That the latter has been profoundly influenced in its details by the former is plain, but Israelite piety has to a large extent purified the deluge-tradition from its dross. It still remains, however, to state what view I take of the history and significance of this much-edited story, and to justify this, so far as is necessary, by the solution of textual problems. On the relation of the deluge-story to that of Sodom and Gomorrah, see on chap. xix.

The history of the myth falls for us into three parts: I. The development which issued in the various Babylonian versions; II. The development of the Indian flood-story; and III. The development of the Hebrew stories conventionally assigned to J and P.

I. The story in the epic is, no doubt, the fullest which Babylonia has given us. But there are also two other texts which apparently refer to the same version of the deluge-tradition—a version which is distinct from that expressed in the Gilgamesh epic. All these versions (including the Berossian) must have developed out of a much shorter and simpler myth. Some mythic details were inserted in this older myth, others were omitted or modified, and to the story thus produced there was applied what may be called a mythic theory respecting events supposed to

[1] See especially Gunkel. I would also refer to 'Deluge' in *Enc. Bib.* and *Enc. Brit.*[(10)]

have occurred in the heavens. In sketching the older and shorter myth, it is permissible to take suggestions from those myths of N. America which open a door, as hardly any others equally do, into the mind of primitive man. Accepting this licence, we may suppose that older myth to have run somewhat as follows:—'The earth (a small enough earth, doubtless) and its inhabitants proved so imperfect that the beneficent superhuman Being who had created it, or perhaps another such Being, determined to remake it. He therefore summoned the serpent or dragon who controlled the cosmic ocean, and had been subjugated at creation, to overwhelm the earth, after which the creator remade it better, and the survivor and his family became the ancestors of a new human race.'[1]

Another representation, however, is not impossible. Adopting a suggestion from one of the N. American sources, we may suppose it to have been said that the serpent, of his own accord, having escaped destruction, maliciously (cp. Rev. xii. 15) flooded that poor little earth, but was again overcome by the greater Being; or again, that the serpent, after filling the inhabited earth with deeds of violence, was at length slain by his opponent, and that the streaming out of his blood produced a deluge.[2] There is nothing rash in either of these or in the preceding conjectures. How can the first flood (issuing in creation) have had its dragon or serpent, and the second (issuing in a renovated world) have had none? There is even an old mythological text (recopied late) in which, probably at least, the year of the deluge is called 'the year of the raging (or, red-shining) serpent.'[3]

Among the minor details of this older myth we may probably include the following:—(1) The warning of the wise and practical hero of the flood by animals; (2) the construction of a raft or rude skiff to contain the hero and his family, and also animals; (3) the despatch of three birds, not (originally) to see in which direction dry land lay, but to bring either mud or some branch of a tree, for the creator,

[1] Article 'Deluge,' *Enc. Brit.*(10)

[2] See the mythological text described in *KAT*(3), pp. 498 *f.*

[3] *Ibid.* p. 554.

in his skill, to convert into the land with all its variety of furniture; and (4) the landing on a mountain. Only a few comments are necessary here. Thus, as to (1), in the Indian myth it is the sacred fish which warns Manu of the flood; in the N. American myths it is an eagle or a coyote (a kind of wolf). As to (2), Usener[1] has shown how common the story is of a divine child cast into the sea in a box. One is tempted to think originally the hero of the Canaanite deluge-story may have been a divine child (cp. Rev. xii. 4); the apotheosis of the hero of the Babylonian story is clearly a modification of the original myth. As to (3), compare the Caingang story, quoted above, and that of the Tlatlasik Indians, where the diving-bird (one of three sent out) returns with a branch of a fir-tree, out of which O'meatl makes mountains, earth, and heaven.[2] As to (4), the mountain doubtless grew in wonderfulness as time went on. Originally, no doubt, it was imagined as some very high mountain in the known world. But afterwards, in Babylonia, it was probably identified with the mountain where the *puḫur ilâni*, 'assembly of the gods,' was held; 'Niṣir' (p. 135) might mean 'guard,' 'watch.' This throws a light on the reward of the hero Ut-napishtim, which was probably (in the original story) not Elysium, but Olympus.

We can also well believe that a simple didactic element very soon found its way into the story. The necessity of maintaining primitive customs and *taboos* would seem to the priests to be a sufficient reason for modifying the story, so that it might run somewhat as we find it in the Gippsland myth already recorded. Possibly the sacrifices were in need of encouragement; hence the stress laid in the chief Babylonian story on the delight of the gods when the hero Ut-napishtim offered his sacrifice.

More extensive alteration became necessary when the agricultural stage of society was reached. It was natural that men should now take a keener interest in celestial phenomena. In some countries an astrological science, or quasi-science, arose. Still more common was a thoroughgoing revision of the inherited myths of origins. According

[1] *Die Sintfluthsagen* (1899), pp. 81-108, 115-127.
[2] Stucken, *Astralmythen*, pp. 233 *f.*

to Schirren,[1] the New Zealand cosmogonies are properly myths of sunrise, and the deluge-stories myths of sunset. It is at any rate a probable theory, long since accepted by the present writer, and after him by Zimmern,[2] that the deluge-stories of Polynesia, early Babylonia, and India were accommodated, at a certain stage of culture, to an imaginative conception of the sun and moon as voyagers on the celestial ocean, and to a large extent recast. When these stories in their new form had been for some time in circulation, rationalistic thinkers obtained the reconversion of the sky-myths into earth-myths, and observation of the damage wrought in winter by excessive rains and inundations suggested the introduction of corresponding details into the new earthly deluge-myth. But Ut-napishtim, who corresponds to Marduk in the parallel story of the fight with Tiâmat, could not altogether put off his solar-mythical character. There is also another vestige of the original celestial myth in the statement (*KB* vi. 237) that the gods, after cowering like dogs, ascended (by the steps of the zodiac) to the highest (*i.e.* most northerly)[3] heaven, the heaven of Anu (p. 134). Here alone could they feel themselves secure.

II. As to the development of the Indian flood-story. It is a great subject of debate whether this story is dependent or not on the Babylonian. For my own part, I think it 'unlikely that such a gifted race as the Aryans of India should not have produced its own flood-story out of the same primeval germs which grew up into the earliest Babylonian flood-story, and almost inconceivable that in its second form the Indian story should not have become

[1] *Wandersagen der Neuseeländer* (1856), p. 193.

[2] See 'Deluge,' *Enc. Brit.*[9], 1877, and § 18, *Enc. Bib.*, 1899; Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie*, vi. 270-273 (1872). After a long interval, this has been sanctioned by Zimmern, *KAT*[3], p. 355, and Winckler, *AOF*, 3rd ser. i. 96. For a more elaborate form of this theory, involving the supposition that *abubu* means not only a storm-flood (p. 134) but a light-flood, see Jensen, *KB* vi. 332 *f.*, 563 *f.*; *Das Gilg. Epos*, pp. 118 *ff.* Cp. also Jeremias, *ATAO*, pp. 134-136; Usener, *op. cit.* p. 239.

[3] Cp. the Hebrew phrase 'the heavens of heavens,' Dt. x. 14, 1 K. viii. 27, 2 Chr. ii. 5, Ps. cxlviii. 7, and see Jeremias, *ATAO*, pp. 10, 27.

adapted to what may be called the celestial mythic theory. The phrase "the northern mountain" for the place where the ship grounded may quite well be the name of an earthly substitute (the epic has, "the highest summit of the Himālaya") for the mythic mountain of heaven. Nor is it unimportant that Manu is the son of the sun-god, and that the phrase "the seven rishis" in classical Sanskrit is a designation of the seven stars of the Great Bear.'

III. With regard to the Canaanite or N. Arabian flood-story which we must suppose to have been adopted by the Israelites, we may probably venture to hold that it had previously passed through more than one stage. First of all, it may have grown up independently from the same simple germs which we have assumed for the primitive Babylonian myth. Then this old story may have been recast, in deference to a popular impulse, by the priests of some leading Israelitish sanctuary. Of course, it was the earth as known to the myth-framers that was represented as having been overwhelmed, and the chief stress would be laid on the effect of the flood on the country where the myth-framers lived, *i.e.* in the one case Babylonia, and in the other Arabia. I think that a keener textual criticism shows that in the underlying, earlier text of the Hebrew deluge-stories the land of 'the Arabians and Yeraḥme'elites' was distinctly spoken of, and that the 'ark' was represented as settling on 'the mountains of Ashtar.' In this view, though it may shock inherited prejudices, there is nothing which can be called paradoxical. The Israelites (if the phrase may be used) certainly sojourned in N. Arabia. It is inevitable to suppose that they borrowed myths from its inhabitants, and even if their chief debt was to the more northern Canaanites, yet these Canaanites themselves, being of the Yeraḥme'elite stock, must have possessed, in some form, the Yeraḥme'elite myths.

That the god who sent the deluge was Yeraḥme'el would at once become highly probable if we might follow 𝔊, and in certain passages restore 'Yahweh-Elohim' for a simple 'Yahweh' or 'Elohim.' At any rate, we can hardly doubt that אל-לבו in vi. 6 and viii. 21 ultimately comes from אֵל ירחמאל (linking forms זבול, ירבעל, and Palm.

ירחבול), so that in vi. 6 we should read, 'and El Yeraḥme'el was grieved,' and in viii. 21 (omitting the second יהוה as redactional) 'and El Yeraḥme'el said,'—unless, indeed, 'El Yeraḥme'el' is to be taken here as a perfectly correct gloss on 'Yahweh.' For 'Yahweh' and 'Yeraḥme'el,' the early writers held, both in deliberation and in action were one. Certainly אל־לבו is absurd. 'Yahweh' in council speaks not 'to his heart (?)' but to his fellow (or fellows).

We now turn to the hero of the deluge. As we have seen (p. 115), his true name is, not Noaḥ, but Ḥanôk—a well-attested N. Arabian name. The parallelism between v. 24 *a* and the closing words of vi. 9 is decisive. The ideal righteous man, who alone deserved to be saved, was Ḥanôk. It was he who was 'a righteous man and blameless in his ways,'[1] not Noaḥ. Shem, Ḥam, and Yepheth, however, are not sons of Ḥanôk, but of Noaḥ or Naḥam (cp. v. 29), the vine-dresser, of whom we read strange things in ix. 20-27. As in the Babylonian deluge-story, the names of the sons of the hero found no place in the original Hebrew narrative. See on xix. 18 *f.*, x. 1.

We can now offer a better explanation of the obscure word מַבּוּל,[2] supposed to mean 'deluge.' In vi. 17 the God announces that he will bring upon the land את־הַמבול מים. According to most scholars, מים (as also in vii. 6) is a gloss on the archaic מבול, though in *v.* 17 Sievers takes the reverse course, and Hommel points מַיִם. מבול, however, has not hitherto been satisfactorily explained. May it not have come from ממול (cp. Syriac), which is a possible corruption of ירחמאל, מ being duplicated as in ממרא? In an earlier form of the Hebrew deluge-story ממול (מבול) was a

[1] For בדרתיו (hardly 'among his contemporaries') in vi. 9 we may perhaps read בדרכיו. This occurred to me before Winckler gave it, with an astral interpretation, in *AOF* xxi. 396. Surely we must not (with *BDB*) defend MT.'s reading by Judg. iii. 2, where דרות is not only itself difficult to interpret, but occurs in a plainly disordered context (see *Crit. Bib. ad loc.*). The alternative is to read ביתור = באשתור, 'in Ashtor.'

[2] See Cheyne, *Psalms*[(1)], pp. 379 *f.*; *E. Bib.*, col. 1061, note 1, and especially Zimmern, *ZDMG* lviii. 953 *f.* For *abubu* = *mabbūl* the latter compares בעל זבוב and βεελζεβουλ, a comparison which is all the more appropriate if זבוב and זבול come ultimately from ישמ׳. See *Crit. Bib.* p. 353.

gloss on הארץ. It was on the land of Yerahme'el that the deluge was sent. Read, therefore, in vi. 17 את־המים על־הארץ, and in vii. 6 והמים היו על־ה׳ ירחמאל. מבול has the same origin in x. 1, 32, xi. 10, Ps. xxix. 10.[1] In the other Genesis passages (vii. 7, 10, ix. 11) it means 'deluge,' through a mistake of redactors, who possibly derived מבול from בול, supposed by them to mean 'rain.' Cp. also Isa. liv. 9, מֵי נח.

This result fits in with the probable results of criticism in vii. 4, 12 (cp. *v.* 17). It is of course *possible* that the seven days' rain in the best-known Babylonian deluge-story was magnified in the Hebrew story into a rain of 'forty days and forty nights.' But considering how often ארבעים and ערבים (or ערב?) are confounded (see on ii. 10, Judg. iii. 11, v. 31, viii. 28, etc.),[2] יום and ימן (see p. 6, note 3), לילה and ירחמאל (see on 2 K. viii. 21, Ps. lxxiv. 16), we may venture to read עֵרֶב יָמָן וְעֵרֶב ירחמאל, a combination of two glosses on הארץ. Note that in viii. 6 ויהי מקץ אר׳ יום is due to the redactor, who had before him vii. 4 and 12 in their corrupt form, and may also have inserted אר׳ יום in vii. 17. See, further, on viii. 6.

Another curious word in the Hebrew story is יקום (vii. 4, 23), which *BDB* explains 'substance, existence,' admitting, however, that the word seems to be used in a 'more limited sense' in Dt. xi. 6. But one may ask, Why should the writer of Dt. xi. 6 have used a word meaning 'existence' when he only meant 'men'? Remembering the names יקים, קמון, and רקם, may we not plausibly suppose that יקום has come from ירחם? The words which follow [ה]יקום are, in *v.* 23, אשר על־פני האד׳, but in *v.* 4, אשר עשיתי מעל פני אד׳, and in *v.* 23 there is a warning Pasek both before and after אשר. Surely, as often, אֲשֶׁר should be אֹשֶׁר, and עשיתי should be אשתר (a variant to אֹשֶׁר). Probably we should harmonise *v.* 4 and *v.* 23,[3] *i.e.* read את־כל־ירחם מעל־פני האד׳, with a double gloss 'Asshur, Ashtar.'

It is interesting to notice that probably there is a correct marginal gloss on יקום. In the strange expression[4]

[1] Read ממול [שפט]ל.

[2] Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Moses,' § 11.

[3] The middle part of *v.* 23 is a redactional supplement (see Kautzsch-Socin).

[4] 'Der wunderliche Ausdruck,' says Gunkel.

נשמת רוח חיים (vii. 22), רוח may be a corruption of ירח', *i.e.* ירחם (the original of יקום). Cp. on i. 2 *b*.

A still more interesting confirmation of the view that the deluge-story is Yeraḥme'elite may now be produced. It has been already remarked by Driver (*Genesis*, p. 106, on viii. 4), 'Why in P the "mountains of Araraṭ" appear in place of Niṣir [see Ašurbanipal's legend], must remain matter of conjecture.' And why the vague expression 'mountains'? Tiele[1] identifies 'Araraṭ' with 'Niṣir,' and explains the former name as shortened from Hara-berezaiti (the mountain Elburz). Most, however, identify it with Urarṭu, which, sometimes at least, included most of the later Armenia. Neither view is satisfactory. It is shown on x. 3 that 'Ashkenaz,' which was certainly near 'Ararat' (see Jer. li. 27), has come from 'Asshur-ḳenaz,' and is the name of a region of N. Arabia, and a careful study of 2 K. xix. 37 in its context, and in the light of other discoveries, shows that ארדט must also be a N. Arabian name, and comparing אטר (see on Neh. vii. 45) and עטרות (see on Num. xxxii. 3) we can hardly help tracing 'Araraṭ' to 'Ashtar'[2] (אשתר). That the mountain of the ark should have been placed, in the Hebrew story, in Armenia is certainly most improbable. Possibly 'Lubar,' the name of the mountain in Jubilees, chaps. v. and x., comes from ארבל =ירחם'. At any rate, it is as good as certain that the mountain on which the ark rested according to the Hebrew story (P and probably J)[3] was Mount Ashtar, for the situation of which, so far as it can be described from the older text, see on Dt. iii. 17.

Let us now turn to some of the minor details. In vi. 14, *KS* and Gunkel give us, 'Build thyself an ark (*KS*,

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Ararat,' § 3. Šanda, however (*Untersuch.* p. 35, ap. Döller), combines 'Ararat' with the cuneiform Arardi, a 'mighty mountain range' in the Kardu region. For the ordinary view see Friedr. Murad, *Ararat u. Masis* (1900).

[2] The benê Aṭer in Neh. vii. 45 occur among the שערים, but the original reading doubtless was אַשֻּׁרִים, Asshurites. This confirms the view given above of אטר. 'Aṭer' also occurs in the Assuan Jewish-Aramaic inscriptions, E 3 (fifth century).

[3] J too must have said that the ark rested on a mountain. Cp. Wellh. *CH*, p. 6.

"ship") of pine-wood; of nought but chambers shalt thou make it.' 'Of pine-wood' is not at all adequate. עצי גפר must mean the timber of some special tree used in building such large and important objects as the 'ark,' not of Moses, but of Noaḥ (Ḥanôk). We cannot determine botanically what the tree referred to was, unless indeed by some easy text-emendation of the ordinary type we can turn גפר into some word which represents or suggests some ascertained tree, such as would be used for the specified purpose either in Palestine or in N. Arabia. I do not, however, see how this feat is to be performed.[1] We must therefore make use of recent experience of the newer textual criticism. We have found that tree-names in Hebrew are often in reality applied names of people or regions. Thus עצי שטים (Ex. xxv. 10 etc.) ultimately comes to mean 'Ṣephathite timber'; of this, according to P, the *ărōn* ('ark') was made. Similarly, עצי אלמגים has been shown to mean 'Yeraḥme'elite timber,' great quantities of which were brought by Hiram and Solomon, not from Ophir, but perhaps from the N. Arabian mountains (see *Crit. Bib.* p. 331, cp. 384). And we only really understand the familiar phrase עץ רענן when we see it to have come from עץ רעמן, 'tree of Raʿaman,' *i.e.* 'of Yeraḥme'el,' with which compare עץ שמן (Neh. viii. 15), from עץ ישמן, 'tree of Yishman,' *i.e.* 'of Ishmael.' גפר then is, at any rate, a corruption of some well-known N. Arabian name, most probably of גמר,[2] for which cp. on פגרים, 2 K. xix. 35, and on בגדים, 2 K. xxii. 14. גמר is one of those numerous corruptions of ירחמאל which early obtained an independent existence (see (on x. 2).—Now as to another critical error. All that the critics dispute about is whether קנים should be read only once (as Sievers) or twice (as Olsh., Lag., etc.). It is apparently not questioned that קֵן, 'nest,' can also mean 'cell' or 'chamber.' The truth is, that קנים is wrong, and

[1] The attempts to illustrate גפר from Babylonian-Assyrian, referred to in *E. Bib.*, 'Gopher,' are of no use unless it may be held that the Hebrew deluge-story is directly dependent on a cuneiform record. The probability of this attractive view must, however, I am afraid, now be regarded as very small.

[2] The presence of כפר at the end of *v.* 14 may, in the present case, have facilitated the corruption.

that most probably it represents a very early variant to the word miswritten גפר, viz. יקנ[ע]ם. The existence of a Yoḳneam (?) in the Arabian border-land is proved. It was in 'Carmel,' *i.e.* a Yeraḥme'elite district (cp. on Josh. xii. 22), and probably, we may say, on the border of the southern Zebulun[1] (see *Crit. Bib.* on Josh. xix. 11). In Dt. xxxiii. 19 (see note) we find Zebulun spoken of as acquiring the mountain-land of the Ishmaelites. 'Timber of Yoḳneam,' therefore, is a very possible phrase. תבת should probably be תבה. The verse thus becomes, 'Make for thyself an ark; of timber of Gomer [Yoḳneam] shalt thou make the ark,' etc. (𝔊's rendering is [ἐκ] ξύλων τετραγώνων, *i.e.* 'עצי מרבע, which may represent עצי ערבים, 'timber of the Arabians,' a variant to עצי גמר.

In vi. 16 *a* we meet with the hard word צהר. Can it be correct? Surely the variety of critical theories, and the warning Paseḳ after צהר, may justly awaken suspicion. In *E. Bib.*, col. 2713, I suggested reading אֶרֶבָּה, *i.e.* 'window,' a sense which seemed to be required (cp. חלון, viii. 6, J). The notion of an opening in the wall running all round above (מלמעלה) was, in spite of Holz.'s Egyptian parallel, too difficult and improbable, and מלמעלה itself was suspicious (see below). 𝔊 renders ἐπισυνάγων, but 𝔊's apparent renderings may so often be suspected of corruption that we may doubt whether this is correct; may it not have arisen out of fragments of καπνοδοχήν (ארבה?)? It has been found, however, that יצהר and צחר are frequent corruptions of אַשְׁחֹר, (*e.g.* Ex. vi. 18, 2 K. xviii. 32, Gen. xlvi. 10, Ezek. xxvii. 18), and it is difficult, in a case where a strong suspicion of corruptness exists, not to correct צהר into אַשְׁחֹר. If so, a word is wanting before 'אש. Can we recover it? Surely we can. The next words, ואל־אמה תכלנה מלמעלה, are untranslatable, and must be corrupt. ואל־אמה and מלמעלה are presumably corruptions of ירחמאל (cp. on אמה, 2 S. viii. 1, and on 'מל, Josh. iii. 13, 16), which is most probably a gloss on אשחר. תכלנה is also corrupt; it covers over the missing word for 'window,' viz.

[1] The theory is, that the Israelites, like the Arabian Yeraḥme'elites before them, carried local and ethnic names with them in their migrations. On the name 'Yoḳneam' see *Crit. Bib.* p. 406.

חתלן, a by-form to חִלּוֹן; cp. Ass. *bît-ḫil(l)âni* or *bît-ḫtlanni* (adopted from western Semitic), *i.e.* 'window-house'; see Muss-Arnolt, *Ass. Dict.* p. 315. Thus *v.* 16 *a* becomes, 'An Ashḥurite [Yeraḥme'elite] window shalt thou make for the ark, and the door of the ark shalt thou put in the side thereof.'

Sievers (pp. 251 *f.*) has proposed to bring vi. 16 *b* into *v.* 14, omitting תעשה; they 'attach themselves well to the preceding קנים.' Other critics are content to understand ק׳, and explain that the ark was to be made in three stories. But (1) קנים is too far off, and (2) קנים cannot mean 'stories'; it is corrupt. *V.* 16 *b* is also corrupt, but experience suggests a remedy. Numerals have often arisen out of corruptions of ethnics; שנים and שלשים are both current corruptions of ישמעאל (see *Crit. Bib.* on Judg. x. 4). A substantive is still wanting before ישמ׳. Probably it is חתלן (see last note); ל passed into ת, and ן into ם. We have therefore a second (misplaced) statement respecting the window—'An Ishmael-window shalt thou make.' 'Ishmael' and 'Ashḥur' are of course synonyms.

Another point may be mentioned here, to confirm the view (see above) that מקץ ארב׳ יום in viii. 6 is due to the redactor. It is that in Ašurbanipal's legend the rescued man sends forth the birds 'when the seventh day arrived.' From the עוד שבעת ימים we may infer that in *v.* 6 it was originally mentioned that Noaḥ (Ḥanôk) waited seven days, and then opened the window, etc. Thus the Hebrew and the Babylonian narratives agree, and מקץ וגו׳ must be redactional.

CONCERNING SHEM, ḤAM, AND YEPHETH (GEN. IX. 18, 19)

A SHORT closing passage, derived from J, implying the mistaken theory (see on v. 32, vi. 10) that Shem, Ḥam, and Yepheth were the sons of the hero of the deluge-story. The sons of Noaḥ (Naḥam) mentioned in the following section were obviously too young to have wives (see vi. 18, vii. 7). The notice respecting Ḥam (*v.* 22) deserves close attention. It is not an attempt to harmonise two different traditions as to the relationship of Canaan. אבי כנען (so too *v.* 22) is a corruption of עֲרַב כ׳ (see on אבי, xxxiii. 19, and cp. on xvii. 4 *ff.*). The note informs us that חם is here to be taken as = 'Canaanite Arabia.' In fact, חם (from ירחמאל) has a somewhat wide application. In Ps. lxxviii. 52, etc., it is a synonym of Miṣrim—a remarkable phenomenon which can be paralleled in the story of Joseph. See also on x. 6.

NOAH'S CURSE AND BLESSING (GEN. IX. 20-27)

A STRANGE narrative derived from a special source, the difficulties of which, both formal and material, are well known to all scholars. Von Bohlen (*Genesis*, p. 201) long ago found in it an 'evident' suggestion of a myth of a Semitic Dionysos. The ancient Greek representations of the god holding in his hand a wondrous vine-plant, whose

branches wind round the ship in which he voyages, are well known. We know too that the essence of the worship of Dionysos was intoxication conceived of as God-possession.[1] It is conceivable that a god or demi-god who brought the vine might have been referred to in the original legends of the Israelites; but the reference would have been in a very different tone from that which we find here. Winckler[2] declares that Dionysos is a sun-god, and consequently not out of place in the deluge-story, which is a solar myth. But there is no probability in this view. It was not the portion of the royal hero of the flood-story to be a cultivator of the soil and to be mastered by wine without any religious compensation. He is the true Noaḥ, or perhaps Naḥam (cp. ינחמני, v. 29, and see *E. Bib.*, 'Noah,' § 3). As to the three great textual difficulties, viz. (1) that Canaan is cursed, while the true offender is Ḥam; (2) that *v.* 24 makes Canaan the youngest son; and (3) that in the blessing Canaan is called the brother of Shem and Yepheth, they can now be seen in a new light.

These, however, are not the only difficulties. For instance, is it legitimate to render *v.* 20 with Gunkel, 'Noaḥ, the husbandman, also began to plant vineyards'? For my part, I doubt this; no Hebrew narrator could have written thus. Plainly *v.* 20 consists of two related but independent statements. Plainly, too, 'ויחל נח איש האד' is wrong. If Noaḥ (Naḥam) was really the first husbandman, why is nothing said about the planting of the corn-plant? The phrasing, too, is certainly unnatural. It is inadequate to emend איש into לְחָרֹשׁ (Kuenen) or לָאָרֹשׁ (Ball), comparing Ass. *eresu*, 'to plant, sow, cultivate,' and *eresi*, 'tillage' (Am. Tab. 55, 19).[3] Experience shows that איש has often come from אשור, *i.e.* the N. Arabian Asshur, and אדמה sometimes probably from ראמה, *i.e.* either ארם or ירחמאל. Asshur or Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el[4] constantly occurs in these

[1] Miss Jane Harrison, *Proleg. to Gk. Religion*, pp. 425 *f.*

[2] *Ar.-sem.-or.* p. 128.

[3] חרש may perhaps mean 'to till' in Job iv. 8, Hos. x. 13.

[4] 'Asshur-Yeraḥme'el' means the Yeraḥme'elite portion of the wide region called Asshur. It was also apparently the name of the first man (see p. 96) and of the God who befriended Hagar (see on xvi. 13).

early Genesis narratives. ויחל should apparently be וַיַּהֵל (for וַיְאַהֵל), from the denominative verb אהל. Read, therefore, in *v.* 20 *a*, 'and Noaḥ (Naḥam) pitched his tent (cp. *v.* 21 *b*) in Asshur-Yeraḥme'el.' That vines anciently grew in this region, is not improbable; see note on xl. 9, Ps. civ. 15 *a*.

Then in *v.* 21, what can be made of 'told it to his two brothers without'? What was there so much amiss in such an act? The son here spoken of was at any rate not the first-born, and might well consult his brethren. From the sequel, indeed, we gather that Canaan had done something worthy of a curse, but the words of *v.* 22 do not of themselves imply this; וירא and ויגד are, morally, quite neutral words. Holzinger and Gunkel suppose that something has fallen out or been omitted, *e.g.* the statement that Canaan took away his father's garment. But how should he have 'told' this to his brothers, who could not but be angry with him? Surely something must be wrong in the text; and it is in accordance with parallels elsewhere to emend לשני אחיו into לאנשי אשחור (see on אחיו, xvi. 12). Thus we get, 'and he told it to the men of Ashḥur,' *i.e.* to the men among whom his father had pitched his tent, with the object (may we suppose?) of attracting them into the tent, and so bringing public contempt on his father? Cp. Hab. ii. 15.

Ver. 24 brings us face to face with the question already mentioned. Is Canaan, in the original text, represented as Noaḥ's youngest son? This is no doubt more plausible than the view that Ḥam appears here as the youngest son, since Ḥam is elsewhere second in the list of sons. It is, however, too bold to cut out חם אבי (Wellh., etc.), for admittedly אבי כנען is correct in *v.* 18. And why has the text not been criticised with due reference to יקטן in x. 25, and קטן in Judg. i. 13, iii. 9? It is difficult not to connect יקטן in x. 25 with יקתאל in 2 K. xiv. 7, which has probably come from אשקאל, *i.e.* אשחר ירחמאל (cp. on אשכל, xiv. 13). This gives the key to קטן both in our passage[1] and in Judg. *l.c.* From *v.* 18 *b* (see note) we learn that Ḥam is = 'Arab-Kena'an, and from our passage that it is interchange-

[1] 𝔊 gives ὁ νεώτερος, on which see Dillmann.

able with Ḳaṭan, *i.e.* Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el. Read, therefore, for בנו הקטן, אשקאל בנו, and observe that Ḥam, with its two synonyms or variants, has here a bad significance; it refers to the ancestors of Israel's bitter N. Arabian enemies.

In *vv.* 25-27 Noaḥ bursts out into alternate curse and blessing, but the curse is more prominent than the blessing. The object of the curse (*v.* 25) is Canaan, *i.e.* 'Arab-Kena'an = Ḥam (*v.* 18 *b*), whose punishment is that he shall be a servant to his brothers, or more probably (correcting אחיו as in *v.* 22) to Ashḥur, a name which is often practically equivalent to 'Ishmael' or 'Yeraḥme'el'; the first man, for instance, was the ancestor of Asshur-Yeraḥme'el. It is true that Canaan (or Ḥam) and Shem have ultimately the same origin; they are sections of the same race. But in usage Asshur-Yeraḥme'el does not refer to the whole widespread Yeraḥme'elite race, but to a portion of it—that portion which is here called 'Shem' (*i.e.* 'Ishmael') and includes 'Israel.' The historical reference in *v.* 25 will be to early events of which no clear tradition has reached us. The phrase עבד עבדים for 'lowest servant' is good Hebrew, but hardly in place here. Possibly עבד (like עבר in Num. xxiv. 24?) has come from ערב, which should precede כנען, while עבדים (עבד') may be an expansion of עבד. Thus *v.* 25 should run ארור ערב כנען | עבד יהיה לאשחור.

In *v.* 26 there is another fragment of curse—'and let Canaan be his servant,' *i.e.* 'Shem's servant.' 'Shem' (in *a*) is certainly not another name for 'Israel,' though it includes Israel. It means Ishmael, and is equivalent to Ashḥur in the preceding line. I agree with Holzinger that the most rational reading is neither בָּרוּךְ (MT.) nor בָּרֵךְ (Grätz, Gunkel, Sievers), but בְּרוּךְ (Budde). But this scholar's explanation of אלהי is hardly adequate; surely it has come from אלהים, which is an expansion of יהוה; in fact, Yahweh-Elohim (from Yahweh-Yeraḥme'el) is the full name of the God of Israel and of Shem. In *b*, למו seems to be a corruption of a mutilated ירחמאל, a gloss on שֵׁם. Let us remember that the name of Israel's greatest progenitor makes him out as originally the ancestor of the Yeraḥme'elites. For עבד read עבדו. Thus *v.* 26 becomes בְּרוּך יהוה [אלהים] שם | ויהי כ' עבדו [ירחמאל].

In *v.* 27 the MT. has introduced a mistaken repetition; so at least, following de Goeje (*Academy*, 1871, p. 398), I venture to think. The alternative is to suppose that the necessary parallel line to וידי כנען וגו׳ has fallen out. The repetition in question is the only textual error in *v.* 27. The 'dwelling in the tents of Shem' refers to the occupation of the tents of Shem (*i.e.* especially Israel) by the Pelištim (= Pelethites?) in the time of Saul. It may be noticed that in x. 6 P makes both פוט (*i.e.* פלט or פלת) and כנען sons of חם; also that the blessing of Shem is in accordance with the fact that in xiv. 22 (as originally read) Yahweh is called the 'God of Yeraḥme'el,' and in xlix. 25 (revised text) the 'Steer of Yeraḥme'el' and the 'God of Asshur.' Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Shem,' § 2, and Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, pp. 219-222.

TABLE OF PEOPLES (GEN. X)

THE endless variety of opinions relative to the grouping of the nations in the so-called Table of Peoples in chap. x. might well discourage a critic from once more trying his fortune on such a hard problem. The difficulty largely arises from the uncertainty of the identifications of the names. For though it is now commonly supposed that a large number of the peoples referred to have been identified,[1] it is only too possible that this may be an illusion. We have, it is true, new critical material, derived from Assyriology and Egyptology, but we can only apply this material to the elucidation of particular names, if Bābel means Babylon, Asshur Assyria, Kush Ethiopia, and Miṣraim or Miṣrim Egypt, and if there is reason to think that J, and

[1] Friedr. Delitzsch starts from this (as he thinks) ascertained point in the third of the *Vorträge* called *Babel und Bibel* (1905).

in a still higher degree P, were very specially interested in the relations of peoples and tribes outside Canaan to Egypt, Babylonia, and Assyria. It has, however, long been suspected that in an earlier form of J's Table the sons of Noaḥ—Shem, Yepheth, and Canaan (rather than Shem, Ḥam, and Yepheth)—represented, not, as in the later form, the world known to the Israelites, but certain tribes or clans of the same comparatively restricted region, presumably in Palestine.[1]

We cannot doubt that Budde and Wellhausen were on the right track in assuming an underlying text of J, which had a different geographical and political horizon. Accepting this theory, Prof. Jastrow[2] has addressed himself to the problem of interpretation, but, with all his ingenuity, can hardly be said to have succeeded. The field is therefore open for fresh investigations. Not without hesitation I take up the work, assuming (1) that Shem, Ḥam, and Yepheth had originally an Arabian significance;[3] and (2) that here, as elsewhere, tribe-names or place-names, which came down to the latest redactor in a corrupt form, were manipulated by him in accordance with incorrect views of geography and history.

The view here taken, and indeed already suggested in the note on ix. 18, is this—that the three sons of Noaḥ are as artificial a product as the three sons of Lamech (iv. 20-22), and formed no part of the genuine popular tradition. Shem (= Ishmael) and Ḥam (Yeraḥme'el) are really synonymous; Yepheth (Yaphleṭ) represents a population which in J's list of peoples is called Pathrusim (Ṣarephathim?) and stands as a son of Miṣrim, with the gloss 'from whom have proceeded the Pelištim' (Pelethim? Ṣarephathim?). But the Miṣrim are, according to an early tradition (see on 'Abrech,' xli. 43), a Yeraḥme'elite race, and the redactor of Gen. x. places the Miṣrim-section, as well as the Nimrod-section and the Canaan-section, under the heading, derived from P, 'and the sons of Ḥam were Kush, Miṣrim, Pūṭ, and

[1] Wellhausen, *CH*, p. 14; Budde, *Urgesch.* p. 365.

[2] 'The Hamites and Semites in the Tenth Chapter of Genesis, *Proceedings of the Amer. Philosophical Society*, xliii. 173-207.

[3] Note that to 'Ḥam,' in ix. 18, is appended the gloss, 'he is 'Arab-Kena'an,' and to 'Shem,' in x. 21, 'he too is 'Arāb.'

Canaan.' Whether, therefore, the Table of Nations be regarded as a whole proceeding from the latest redactor, or in its different parts, the value attached to it by critics is out of all proportion to its real worth. Even Glaser's Arabian researches do not, so far as I can at present see, serve to rehabilitate it to any appreciable extent.[1]

The Table, as it now stands, opens with words which remind us of ix. 18, 'the sons of Noaḥ who went out of the ark were Shem, Ḥam, Yepheth.' This passage, however, is redactional, and does not at all prove that אחר המבול in x. 1 *b* is correct. Why, indeed, should we be told that the descendant's of Noaḥ's three sons were born 'after the flood'? This is surely a matter of course. There was no need to assume such a very oblivious reader as the ordinary reading of the text presupposes. What we expect is some guidance as to the geography of the Table. And we are not doomed to disappointment, for מבול does not mean 'flood' —this is a pure imagination of ancient redactors; it is a corruption of ירחמאל (see on vii. 6), just as אחר is of אַשְׁחֻר. In short, the correction 'in Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el' is once more in a high degree probable. See on ix. 28, x. 32, and note that *v.* 1 *b*, with the reference to Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el, most probably comes from the fragment of the original Table of the Yahwist.

Comparing the Yahwist (J) and the Priestly Writer (P) in the present text, we are struck by the fact that both writers give us some names which may plausibly be accounted for by the help of Assyriology, while only J presents any name like Pathrusim (*v.* 14) which can with a superficial plausibility be explained by Egyptology. It should be remarked, however, that even Pathrusim (= Pathros) only means Upper Egypt if we accept certain other identifications which, both in Gen. x. and in Isa. xi. 11, are highly problematical (cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Pathros').

Our first object, then, must be to see whether the light which is supposed to be derivable from Assyriology is genuine. Is Asshur Assyria? Is Babel Babylon? Is Gomer the Gimirrai of the inscriptions? It so happens that the last of these names (Gomer) is the first in the list of the

[1] See his *Skizze der Gesch. u. Geogr. Arabiens*, chaps. xxvi. etc.

sons of Yepheth in *v.* 2. It is convenient to take P's portion of the Table of Nations first, and we naturally make our first halt at this name.

If a relatively ancient tradition is to be heard, *Gomer* (גמר) is a term for certain tribes whose home was in Phrygia (see Dillm.) Later writers, with much positiveness, identify it with the Gimirrai of the Assyrian inscriptions. But is this dogmatism justified? It is true that Madai, Tubal, and Meshek also occur in the inscriptions, but it would be rash to assume that the identification of these names with names in the inscriptions is necessarily correct. The fact that five of the names of descendants of Yepheth (Gomer, Magog, Tubal, Meshek, Togarmah) also occur in Ezek. xxxviii. ought to give us pause. For whatever be the geographical horizon of some other parts of the book ascribed to Ezekiel, there is reason to hold that, at any rate, in chap. xxxviii. *f.* the horizon is N. Arabian. I cannot turn aside from Genesis to prove this. It has, in fact, already been shown to be highly probable (see *Crit. Bib.*, 'Ezekiel,' and *E. Bib.*, 'Prophecy,' § 27), and I claim the right to build upon this result. Gomer, then, and not less the other names mentioned, viz. Magog, Tubal, Meshek, and Togarmah, are presumably N. Arabian. The truth most probably is that *Gomer* should be grouped with *māgōr* (Jer. vi. 25, etc.), Migron (1 S. xiv. 2), Mag in [A]rab-mag (Jer. xxxix. 3), Regem in Regem-melech (Zech. vii. 2), Garmi (1 Chr. iv. 19), Gemariah (Jer. xxxvi. 11), and Gammadim (Ezek. xxvii. 11), which are all best explained (see detailed criticism elsewhere) as N. Arabian names. The common original of the names of this group is *raḥam*[1] (ירחם = רחם, the shorter form of ירחמאל). We can now understand the significant title of the wife of Hosea, 'Gomer bath-Diblaim' (Hos. i. 3), where דבלים most probably comes from רבלי, *i.e.* ירבעל = ירחמאל. See *Crit. Bib. ad loc.*

We have now a starting-point for the investigation of *Māgōg*, by which critics have hitherto been baffled. 'The explanation "Scythians" is generally accepted, but no one thus far can say what the real signification is, nor point to this designation elsewhere' (Dillm.). But the name is even

[1] Cp. גול and חול.

more insecure than Dillmann supposes. Holzinger sees this, but his only suggestion is that מגוג should be גוג, 'the Antichrist of Ezekiel,' and proceeds to reproach P with his want of real knowledge. The proposed change, however, is most arbitrary; why should not גוג be a fragment of מגוג? And what do the critics give as the origin of גוג? One connects it with the gentilic Gâgaya, 'of the land of Gâg' (Am. Tab. i. 38 = 'barbarian'); others with Gugu, the Gyges of Lydia; and again, others with Ass. *Gagu*, ruler of the land of Saḥi, N. of Assyria, in the time of Ashur-bani-pal.[1] Ezekiel, however (if it be this prophet), tells us plainly enough, Gôg is a prince of certain districts or regions in the farther parts of Ṣāphōn, and in Joel ii. 20 he is referred to as 'the Ṣephōnite.' Now Ṣāphōn, in Jer. iii. 12, 18, iv. 6, vi. 1, 22, x. 22, is the name of the region whence Jeremiah expected an invasion. In Ezek. i. 4 it designates the region whence an appearance of Yahweh came to Ezekiel, and in Isa. xiv. 13 it is there that the mountain of the gods was situated. The study of these passages in their context shows that an Arabian region must be referred to, and the discovery that צבעון (xxxvi. 2) is a corruption of ישמעאל leads to the natural hypothesis that צפון (like צפירון) is a dialectal variation of צבעון, and designates an extensive Ishmaelite region (extensive because of the phrase ירכתי צ׳). 'Gog,' then, as well as 'Togarmah,' which is also in 'the recesses of Ṣāphōn' (Ezek. xxxviii. 6), is an Ishmaelite or Yeraḥme'elite name. It might of course be equally well used for a country and for a royal personage[2] (cp. 'Asshur' in Isa. x. 5 for the king of Asshur).—And what of the מ in מגוג? May we, with Halévy (*REJ* xiii. 10) and Sayce (*HCM*, p. 125) regard it as a fragment of the Ass. *mat*, 'country'? Clearly not, if Gôg is an Arabian name; and even if Gôg is equal to Gugu (Gyges), to treat *Magog* as if it were on an Assyrian tablet is arbitrary.[3] The

[1] See, further, Johns, *Ass. Deeds*, iii. 161 *f.*

[2] Winckler sees under 'Gog' the figure of Alexander the Great (*AOF* ii. 160 *ff.*); N. Schmidt, that of Mithridates VI. of Pontus (*E. Bib.*, col. 4332). Unsatisfactory speculations.

[3] According to Sayce, 'Magog' = mat-Gugu. Halévy, however, makes it = mat-Gamgum in Armenia; *m* and *w* being confounded, the Israelites heard this pronounced מַחְגֻגוּ, which became מָגוֹג, just as in Assyrian mat-Zamua became Mazamua (*REJ* xiii. 10).

only satisfactory course is to find an Arabian name which will account for the reading מגוג, and consequently also for גוג. For this we must go to Jer. vi. 25, xx. 3, etc., and Jer. xxxix. 3, 13. The מגור מסביב in the former passages is plainly a poor conjecture to make sense of an unintelligible and already corrupt phrase; see Duhm's comment on xx. 3, and his naïve remark, 'Jeremiah's "terror all around" much pleased the later writers' (on xlix. 29). The fact is that סביב and מסביב often stand for יבוס, *i.e.* ישמעאל (see on x. 16); מגור is doubtless a parallel form to גמר; *i.e.* both forms have the same origin (see above). Similarly, in Jer. xxxix. 3, 13, רב־מג comes from עֶרֶב־מגר (or עֶרֶב־גמל); see above, on 'Gomer,' and cp. רב־סרים, רב־שקה, *i.e.* 'Arab-Asshur,' 'Arab-Ashḥur.' The conclusion is that גוג is a fragment of גוגם, or גרגם, or גלגם, or some similar form, ultimately derived from ירחמאל. For the duplication of a radical letter, cp. למואל and מהללאל from ירחמאל; סיסרא and סרים from אשור; ששך from אשחר; סוס, שוש, and שמש from ישמעאל; ממרא from ארם; אביב (Ezek. iii. 15) from אב = ערב; סביב from יבס. We may support this view of the origin of 'Gog' and 'Magog' by the name אגג, applied to an Amalekite or Yerahme'elite king (1 S. xv. 8,[1] Num. xxiv. 7). Another form of the same name is עוג; we may also, perhaps, compare אגור (Prov. xxx. 1) and הגר (Gen. xvi. 1).

As to *Madai* (מדי), our experience with 'Gomer' and 'Magog' suggests caution. It is true that in Esth. i. 3, Dan. v. 28, vi. 8, viii. 20, 'Madai' is coupled with 'Paras.'[2] But it is clear that there was a N. Arabian 'Paras'; why should there not have been a N. Arabian 'Madai'? In Jer. xxv. 15-26 it is highly improbable that any of the names of peoples refer to regions far away from Arabia. On *v.* 25 (the verse which contains 'Madai') Cornill gives away his own case by remarking that here 'the catalogue melts quite

[1] 𝔊 and Pesh. here presuppose גוג.

[2] That Esther and Daniel, like Tobit, have been worked over, scarcely admits of a doubt. פרס may come from פתרוס (see on 'Pathrusim,' *v.* 14). Cp. also ספרת, Ezra ii. 55 (with art.), Neh. vii. 57, where note that עבדי שלמה should be עֶרֶב ישמעאל, 'Ishmaelite Arabia.' See *E. Bib.*, col. 4690.

away into unreality (*ins Bodenlose*).' The truth is far from this. Zimri (see on xxv. 2), Elam (see on *v.* 22), and Ṣāphōn (see above) we know as Arabian names; Sheshak too is Ashḥur (see above). 'Madai,' then, is most probably an Arabian name. Possibly, however, מדי should be מרי, and one may remember that Mari' is the name of the king of Mat-ša-imêrišu (the most powerful state in Syria, whose capital was Di-maš-ḳi), who paid tribute to the Assyrian king Rammân-nerari (805-803 B.C.). For the names Imêrišu and Dimašḳi are surely of N. Arabian origin, the former being related to אמר (= ארם = ירחמ'), the latter to אדום־אשחר. Other names related to מרי are ירמי, ירמיה, מריה, מרים, מרה.

We now come to יָוָן—a word much discussed, but without any thoroughly satisfactory result. According to Stade,[1] 'the word יָוָן designates, in exact accordance with its origin, the people of the Ionians, not only with the exilic prophets Ezekiel and II. Isaiah, but also with the post-exilic Joel.' He thinks that the first attempt to use it in a wider sense is in Gen. x. 4. Here different seafaring Mediterranean peoples, certainly the inhabitants of Tartessus, Rhodes, and Cyprus, but probably also the Carthaginians, are subsumed under the conception Ionians.' A still further development is supposed. 'In the sense "Hellenes" it is first found in Zech. ix. 13, Dan. viii. 21, x. 20, *i.e.* in writings of the Hellenistic period.'[2] All this is thoroughly worked out, but upon an unsound textual basis. There is no single passage in which any one of these three meanings is either required or even more than superficially plausible, and sometimes (*e.g.* in Ezek. xxvii. 19) an Arabian reference is irresistibly called for. For a discussion of the O.T. passages see *E. Bib.*, 'Javan,' and note that in Dan. viii. 20 *f.* the king of Yavan is mentioned directly after the kings of Madai and Paras (see above, on 'Madai'), and in x. 20 the prince of Yavan directly after the prince of Paras

[1] *Das Volk Javan* (1880), reprinted in *Akad. Reden u. Abhandlungen* (1899), pp. 123-142.

[2] According to Torrey, יון in Dan. viii. 21, x. 20, xi. 2 (as in 1 Macc. and in the Talm.) means the Greek kingdom of Syria (Jastrow, p. 177, note 1).

(cp. xi. 2, and see *E. Bib.*, 'Paras'). As to Yāvān in Gen. x. 3, it is plain that if the other names in *v.* 2 are rightly explained, it must refer to an Arabian region. An earlier form of the name is יָמָן, which has sometimes become ימין (see on בנימין, xxxv. 18). Most probably it is a shortened form of ישמן (=ישמעאל); cp. אחר from אשחֶר, and אחימן from אשחֶר ישמעאל, or א׳ ירחמאל. With בני יון (*v.* 4) we may compare בני היונים, Joel iv. 6, which, in spite of Nowack's 'doubtless,' cannot mean 'the Greeks,' because of the parallel שבאים, 'the Sabæans' (cp. Jer. vi. 20), and must mean 'the Arabian Yamanites.' The adventurer Yamani, who displaced the king of Ashdod appointed by Sargon, and who was surrendered by the king of Meluhha ('Yerahme'el' = N.W. Arabia), may possibly have come, not from Cyprus, but from Arabia.

Tubal and *Meshek* are often combined. It is plausible to connect the names with the Ass. *Tabali* and *Muški* (the Tibareni and Moschi of classical writers).[1] A close study, however, of the O.T. passages in which they occur (especially Ezek. xxxii. 26, xxxviii. 2 *f.*) shows that both תבל or תובל (Ezek. once; Isa. once) and משך are N. Arabian names. The former is a shortened and corrupt form of ישמעאל, to be grouped with טוב (from ׳טוב = תובל, Judg. xi. 3, 5), טבאל (Isa. vii. 6), טבליהו (1 Chr. xxvi. 11), טבולים (Ezek. xxiii. 15), בתואל (Gen. xxii. 22) ביתאל (Gen. xxxv. 6), אתבעל (1 K. xvi. 31), אשבעל (1 Chr. viii. 33), אשבל (Gen. xlvi. 21), שובל (Gen. xxxvi. 20). In iv. 22 (see note) we meet with the compound form תובל-קין, 'Tubal of Ḳain,' and in 2 S. x. 6, 8, איש טוב, *i.e.* אשור תובל, 'Asshur of Tubal' (cp. on איש, Gen. ix. 20). It is evident that the Arabians took the form Tabal or Tubal with them in their early northern migrations; since we find Tuba'lu as the name of a king of the Phœnician Ṣidon in the time of Sennacherib (*KB* ii. 90). It is also well worth considering whether תבל (usually rendered 'world') in Prov. viii. 26 and some other passages, and תמול and אתמול often, must not be corruptions of ישמעאל. Whether Tibal, a Babylonian divine name (Hommel, *Gr.* p. 164, note 4), has any connexion with תובל, I know not.

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Tubal and Meshech.' Ps. cxx. 5 is a sore trial to commentators who have no key.

The companion-name משך is also no longer obscure. At first one might suppose it to have been produced by a redactor out of כֻּשָׁם. Most probably, however, it is a development from אֲרַם אַשְׁחֻר,[1] 'Aram of Ashḥur,' just as שכם (see on xii. 6, xxxiii. 18) is probably a contraction of שכרם, *i.e.* אש' אֲרַם, 'Ashḥur of Aram (= Yeraḥme'el).' In fact, רמשך is the linking form between ארם אש' and משך; its existence in the original text of several O.T. passages must not be dogmatically denied; and the question even arises whether רמשך does not underlie דמשק wherever this word occurs in the traditional text.[2] And where was רמשך (= רמשק) or משך? A study of the passages where it occurs shows the high probability that it was somewhere in N. Arabia; possibly it was the region in which Shimron was situated, for in Am. iii. 12 one of two glosses on 'in Shimron' appears to be 'in Ramshaḳ of Asshur.'[3] See, further, on *v.* 11 ('Asshur'), and on ix. 20 (the words underlying וישת וגו').

The next name *Tiras* (תירס) was very likely appended from a pure misunderstanding. The Priestly Writer, like the Chronicler, was very apt to repeat the same name, traditionally received, in different corrupt and independent forms. One might therefore suppose that תורס was originally תורס, *i.e.* the Tyrs-eni of classical writers, and that it was a marginal *correction* of the תרשיש in *v.* 4. The truth, however, doubtless is that both תירס and תרשיש are corrupt variants, and that the common original of both is אשת[ו]ר. See on 'Tarshish,' *v.* 4, and *E. Bib.*, 'Tiras.' Cp. also בנתרש, the name of a witness to a deed in an Assuan Aramaic document (A. 19), where תרש comes from אשתר.

V. 3 introduces us to the 'sons' of Gomer. We have to ask whether the names can be at least as well explained on

[1] The vocalisation must have been altered. שך must originally have been שַׁךְ or rather שַׁח; cp. שַׁחַר, one of the forms of אשחר. For the fragmentary מ in משך cp. the equally fragmentary ב (*i.e.* עֲרָב) in בצלאל, בשן, בשלם, etc. (see on Ex. xxxi. 2).

[2] There can be no *a priori* objection to supposing that both forms (with *d* and with *r*) are, in different places, to be read. Similar problems are raised by כשרים (see on xi. 28).

[3] See *Hibbert Journal*, July 1905, p. 831.

the Arabian theory as on that which is now prevalent, viz. that the Priestly Writer, to whom *vv.* 2-5 are assigned, had a geographical horizon as extensive as that of the writers of the geographical lists in Ašurbanipal's library.[1] And the answer is that they can be explained best on the new theory. Take *Ashkenaz.* Is this really from a hypothetical Ašgunza, whence the Ašguza of Esar-haddon (see *E. Bib.*, cols. 334, 4331; Winckler, *KAT*[(3)], p. 101)? If so, Ashkenaz would mean the Scythians. But how much more natural is it to take כנז as the well-known tribal name קנז, in the list of the sons of Eliphaz the son of Esau (xxxvi. 11)! עשו, as is shown elsewhere, is most probably a mutilated form of עשור (=אשור), so that it is highly plausible to account for the prefixed אש as a shortened form of אשור (cp. אשכל from אֹשֶׁר ירחמאל, אשדוד from אשר דוד, and באש from בְּאֹשֶׁר in Jer. xxix. 21, reading also קִטֶּלָם for קָלָם). In Jer. li. 27 we once more meet with 'Ashkenaz'; the companion names are 'Ararat' and 'Minni.'[2] Now we have seen already (on viii. 4) that ארט is probably a distortion of אשתר, and no great skill is required to recognise ימן underlying מני; can we hesitate, then, to claim the original writer of Jer. li. 27 as a supporter of the view that 'Ashkenaz' is equivalent to 'Asshur-ḳenaz'?

The next name *Riphath* is 'an insoluble enigma' (Halévy).[3] But why? Simply because the critics have taken up a wrong point of view. ריפת may naturally come from אפרת (see on xxxv. 19), which, on referring to xv. 18 *f.* (see note), we shall admit to be rightly grouped with קנז. *Togarmah*,[4] which follows, is mentioned again in Ezek. xxvii. 14 between Yavan, Tubal, Meshek (*v.* 12) and Dedan (*v.* 15), and in xxxviii. 6, in connexion with Gomer, as a district of Ṣaphon = Ṣibeʿon (*i.e.* Ishmael). In both passages בית is prefixed without apparent reason. Considering that תוב (or טוב) and בית are liable to confusion

[1] Cp. Jastrow, pp. 184 *f.*

[2] 𝔊 does not recognise מני.

[3] *REJ* xiii. 13. In xvii. 164, however, Halévy connects ריפת (פירת) with a region called Bit Purutash, mentioned by Sargon, between Moschene, Tabalene, and Cilicia; *sh*, he says, is an 'adventitious suffix.'

[4] 𝔊 gives Torgama.

(cp. on ביתאל, Gen. xxxv. 6), we may reasonably hold that בית here comes from תוב׳, *i.e.* תובל; in this case the initial ת in תגרמה probably comes from ת׳, *i.e.* תובל, on which תוב׳ would be a marginal correction. גרמה is of course = גמרה, *i.e.* a feminine form of גמר, which, in Gen. x. 3 and Ezek. xxxviii. 6, precedes. The place-name Tilgarimmu (on the border of the northern Tabal), compared with Togarmah by Friedr. Del. (*Par.* p. 246), may have a similar origin (cp. *Crit. Bib.* on Ezek. iii. 15). Winckler identifies it erroneously with the northern Muṣri (*AOF* ii. 2, p. 131).

It is therefore decidedly the most probable view that Gomer and the connected names refer to people established, not 'in the north-eastern or eastern section of Asia Minor,'[1] but in N. or E. Arabia. To say that they were only of interest to Hebrews in relation to 'the threatening advance movement of northern hordes during the seventh century B.C.' is to assert more than can be rendered probable, and is connected with the very questionable theory that Jeremiah and Zephaniah anticipated a Scythian invasion. We now pass on to the 'sons of Yavan,' and ask whether the list of names in *v.* 4 is consistent with the view that the 'Yavan' of *v.* 2, as well as of the other O.T. passages, has an Arabian, and more particularly N. Arabian, reference, or whether it rather suggests 'groups to the west and north-west, more particularly the inhabitants of the Grecian islands, and those settled along the coast of Asia Minor.'[2]

The Yavanites (*v.* 4) fall into two groups—(*a*) Elishah and Tarshish, (*b*) Kittim and Dodanim. The sound of the name *Elishah* (אלישה) has suggested a possible connexion with Elissa, the name of the legendary founder of Carthage; 'Elishah' might, as Winckler (*AOF* i. 449) thinks, be the old name of Carthage, and be extended so as to take in the N. African coasts. Jensen (see p. 134) even connects 'Elishah' with the Greek 'Elysium.' Prof. F. Brown (*E. Bib.*, 'Elishah') hesitates between Carthage and S. Italy and Sicily, where were Greek colonies. Still following the sound, Conder[3] and W. Max Müller[4] think of the Alashia of the Amarna Tablets, which Müller, after Winckler, now

[1] Jastrow, *op. cit.* p. 176.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 188.
[3] *PEF Qu.* 1892, p. 45.
[4] *OLZ*, Aug. 1900, 289 *f.*

identifies with Cyprus.[1] It is true, nothing is said in the Tablets of purple-blue and purple-red stuffs as the produce of Alashia, and these are just what are mentioned in Ezek. xxvii. 7 as coming from the 'sea-coasts of Elishah.' But copper is mentioned (in *v.* 13) as supplied by Yavan, Tubal, and Meshek, and 'Lucian'[2] places Elishah, not only in *v.* 4, but also in *v.* 2 (not, however, in Chron.), between Yavan and Tubal. This involves denying that Kittim is = Cyprus, and reading אי for איי in Ezek. xxvii. 7 (so, in fact, Müller). It may seem strange that such an archaic name should appear as late as Ezekiel, but it seems to have been resuscitated in Egypt in the Greek period. As to the 'purple' spoken of, we find purple mentioned as a product of Cyprus in the Greek period.[3] Much of this is plausible, provided that we do not question the prevalent theory of Yavan, and abstain from a comprehensive study of Ezek. xxvii. 'Yavan,' however, need not anywhere in O.T. mean the Greek peoples, and the central figure of the poem in Ezek. xxvii. is, not Sōr (Tyre), but Miṣṣōr, the capital of Miṣṣōr or Miṣrim (the N. Arabian Muṣri). The latter point is of much importance. It is doubtful whether any of the places spoken of as trafficking with this city are outside S. Palestine and Arabia. It follows, then, that אלישה is to be grouped with אלוש (Num. xxxiii. 13 *f.*), שאול (Gen. xxxvi. 37), ליש (1 S. xviii. 17), לישה (Isa. x. 30), שלשה (1 S. ix. 4), all Ishmaelite or N. Arabian names. It means some region of Arabia, inhabited, now or formerly, by an Ishmaelite or Yerahme'elite people. The word prefixed to it (אִיִּי; cp. א' כתיים, Ezek. xxvii. 6, Jer. ii. 10; א' הים, Isa. xi. 11, xxiv. 15, Esth. x. 1; א' הגוים, *v.* 5, Zeph. ii. 11, and איים, Isa. xl. 15, xli. 1, 5, and often) is probably a redactional alteration of עֲרַב,[4] and is therefore not to be compared with Ass. *nagē*, plur. of *nagū*, 'district, land, circuit, island.'

Very naturally the next name is *Tarshish.* Can this

[1] Sayce, however, prefers Lycia, or the neighbouring coast of Asia Minor (*Exp. Times*, Oct. 1900, p. 87).

[2] Cp. Nestle, *ZATW*, 1904, pp. 135 *ff.*

[3] Müller, *OLZ*, as above.

[4] See *e.g.* Isa. xi. 11 *b*, where as a final summing-up is added the phrase מִמַּעֲרַב יִכֹּן (underlying ומאיי הים). See, further, on *v.* 5.

name be methodically explained so as to harmonise with the other names in the list? It is still almost universally held that 'Tarshish' means the mining region in S. Spain. Prof. Haupt has repeatedly defended this view.[1] According to him, תרשיש is an infinitive of the intensive stem of רשש, 'to strike with a pick, to pound, crush, stamp (ores, etc.).' More plausibly Knobel and Frz. Del. hold that 'Tarshish' is connected with 'Tyrseni' (cp. on 'Tiras'). It is plain, however, that this is inconsistent with the view here taken of 'Yavan' and 'Elishah,' and some better solution ought to be obtainable by comparing 'Tarshish' with analogous corrupt forms, and by noticing the names near which it is placed elsewhere in the O.T. So then let us compare תרשיש with (*a*) שישק and (*b*) סיסרא. (*a*) can be shown to have come from אַשְׁחֻר, and (*b*) from אַשּׁוּר.[2] Then, turning to Esth. i. 14 and 1 Chr. vii. 10, we find 'Tarshish' placed near 'Shethar' (שתר) and 'Aḥishaḥar' (אחישחר); the former is clearly shortened from אשתר,[3] and the latter is but slightly modified from אשחור. The original of תרשיש is now seen to be אשתר (here a regional name). On the famous phrase 'ships of Tarshish' see *E. Bib.*, 'Tarshish,' closing section.

Kittim (כתים), as the older critics (*e.g.* Dillm.) think, is Cyprus. Certainly כתי and כת in Phœnician mean the city of Kition; but is it likely that the city gave its name to the island? Gunkel thinks that Cyprus, at any rate, is too narrow a meaning; Winckler[4] supposes כתים to be the farthest point at which Phœnician colonies were founded; Jeremias[5] thinks of S. Italy, especially Sicily, but, like Winckler, supposes Kittim in Dan. xi. 30 to mean Rome. W. M. Müller[6] holds with Winckler, and advises waiting for fresh material.

[1] *Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902), p. 40; *Johns Hopkins Univ. Circulars*, No. 163, June 1903.

[2] See *Crit. Bib.* on 1 K. xi. 40 (where, however, כושי should be אַשְׁחֻר). 'Sisera,' it is too often forgotten, occurs not only in Judg. iv. 2 but also in Ezra ii. 53, where it is preceded by חרשא = אשחר and ברקוס = עֲרַב כוש.

[3] אסתר, the name of the heroine of the Book of Esther, has the same origin (cp. תירס beside תרשיש). הדסה, Esther's other name, doubtless derives from [א]שחר. Esther, like Judith and Tobit, was recast.

[4] *AOF* ii. 422, note 1. [5] *ATAO*, p. 154. [6] *OLZ*, as above.

But can we not even now throw some fresh light on the name? Let us turn to 2 K. xvii. 24. Here we meet with a place called כותה, and close by we find names which admit of being explained as N. Arabian. 'Kuthah' would seem to have been at some distance from 'Shimron.' The weight of this argument, of course, depends on a wide induction of passages. We may also compare the obscure תכיים in 1 K. x. 22 *b*, which, at any rate, does not mean 'peacocks,' and (see *Crit. Bib. ad loc.*) may have come from some N. Arabian ethnic; also the phrase שמן כתית, which probably means 'oil of *'; כתית appears to represent some corrupt place-name, and the duplicated ת may probably be explained like the duplicated ג in מגוג (see above, *v.* 2). What, then, is the כת which enters into כתים, תכיים, and כתית?[1] It is a N. Arabian place-name, probably מעכת (which appears in 2 Chr. ii. 9 as מכות). That Maacah or Maacath designates a region in the N. Arabian border-land is hardly desirable (see on 2 S. iii. 3, and cp. xiii. 37). Ethnics and place-names are often mutilated (cp. Ḥur from Ashḥur) as, according to this view, 'Maacath' was mutilated into 'Cath.' Very possibly the כתי which we find in Phœnician inscriptions as a designation of the place or district called in Greek 'Kition,' on the S. coast of Cyprus, was brought, like other names, by early immigrants from their Arabian home.

That *Dōdānīm* should be read *Rōdānīm*[2] (Sam., and Chr. in MT.) and explained 'Rhodians' (𝔊 Ῥόδιοι) is a widespread but questionable theory (see *E. Bib.*, 'Dodanim'). The Hebrews must, indeed, have been acquainted with both Cyprus and Rhodes, but we cannot suppose that these islands would be referred to in a book of Israelitish legends. The right reading is either דְּדָנִים (Isa. xxi. 13, and cp. *Crit. Bib. ad loc.*) or, perhaps better, דֹּדָנִים. The form דֹּדָן would be related to דֹּד, as לוטן is related to לוט; 'Dod' is not only the name of a god, but the designation of an Arabian district (cp. אשדוד, *i.e.* אַשֶּׁר דּוֹד). Cp. on 'Dedan,' *v.* 7.

The four words which open *v.* 5 are thus rendered by

[1] תוך in Ps. lxxii. 14 also probably comes from מעכת (see Cheyne, *Ps.*(2) *ad loc.*); cp. כות.

[2] It is equally wrong to read רֹדָן for דֹּדָן in Ezek. xxvii. 15 *a*.

Kautzsch-Socin, 'From them branched off the population on the islands and coasts of the Gōyīm.' Evidently the translators feel a difficulty here. To render אִיֵּי 'the population on the islands and coasts (of),' and to treat הגוים as an ethnographical term, is a bold act. It is true, the phrase איי הגוים may be paralleled by the phrase איי הים (Isa. xi. 11, xxiv. 15, Esth. x. 1). But is such a phrase as 'the islands and coasts of the sea' (as Kautzsch presumably would render איי הים) tolerable? If איים, as is commonly supposed, means 'islands' or 'sea-coasts,' can we believe that a Hebrew writer would put it in construction with הים? And is it probable that the countries mentioned as the lands of exile in Isa. xi. 11 would be described summarily[1] as 'the islands and coasts of the sea'? Or that in Isa. xxiv. 15 באיי הים, if it means 'in the coasts of the sea,' should be parallel to בארים, where it is clear enough that אֻרִים should be ארם? Or that in the original form of Esth. x. 1, King 'Ahasuerus' was really said to have 'laid a tribute upon the land and the [western] coasts of the sea'?[2] Into the passages which contain the word אִיִּים alone (*i.e.* not איי הים), we cannot here enter. But even from the three passages containing the phrase איי הים we may plausibly infer that the MT. is not correct, and in the light of the results won elsewhere, it is probable that איי הים is the designation of a region in Arabia; indeed, as stated already, איי הים has most likely sprung from עֲרַב יָמָן, 'Arabia of Yaman,' while איים, placed alone, appears to have come from ערבים, and אי from ערב.[3] Cp. the name איזבל, where אי = אבי = ערב, and זבל.

The result is that the four opening words should be read thus, מאלה נפרדו ערב הגוים. It is true, this cannot be translated as it stands. It is nevertheless correct; only ערב should be relegated to the margin, as a gloss on הגוים or some following word. Is this an arbitrary conjecture? Surely not. See *v.* 32 (P), ומאלה נפרדו הגוים (without איי

[1] Cp. Isa. lxvi. 19, where (in MT.) Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, Tubal and Javan are described as 'the far-off *'iyyīm*' ('islands, coasts'?).

[2] In Esth. i. 1 הדו cannot safely be rendered 'India.' Read מֵחֲדַר. In x. 1, על־ארץ אַשְׁחֵר וַעֲרַב־יָמָן.

[3] See *Crit. Bib.* on Isa. xx. 6, xli. 1, Ezek. xxvi. 18, xxvii. 15 (ירבם represents ערבים, the original reading of which איים is the alteration).

before הג׳). In that passage מאלה refers to the 'sons of Noaḥ,' including their clan-forming descendants, whereas here (*v.* 5) it refers specially to the 'sons of Yepheth.' It is possible that *v.* 5 originally agreed very nearly in form with *v.* 32, *i.e.* that it ran, 'These are the sons of Yepheth, according to their clans, and from these the nations parted themselves . . .'; but also that מאלה נפרדו הגוים in *v.* 5 has been inserted in error, and has displaced אלה בני יפת ('these are the sons of Yepheth'), which must, at any rate, be restored either at the beginning of *v.* 5 or else after הגוים. The absence of any reference to the 'parting' of the 'nations' in *vv.* 20 and 31 favours the former suggestion.

The remainder of *v.* 5 suggests problems which have been too slightly examined. Kautzsch-Socin render, '(These are the sons of Yepheth) according to their lands, their different languages, their tribes and populations.' No note is attached to this. Yet איש ללשנו and בגויהם are strange, and corruption is strongly indicated. It is probable that איש comes from אשור (cp. on ix. 20) and ללשנו from ישמעאל (cp. on Josh. vii. 21(?), xv. 2, xviii. 19, Isa. xi. 15, lxvi. 18, Ps. lxiv. 9, cxx. 3, cxl. 12), while בגויהם may represent בני ירחם, a gloss on בני חם (*v.* 6).

There still remains בארצתם. This has probably come from בארצ, which was misread בארצ׳, *i.e.* (as was thought) בארצתם. A marginal gloss (now corrupted into איי, see above) explained that 'in the land of Asshur-Yeraḥme'el' meant '(in) Arabia.' The same or similar problems meet us in *vv.* 20, 31, 32. Note the importance attached to the fact that here, as elsewhere (see on *v.* 1), the *Urgeschichte* of the Hebrews had for its scene the land of the Yeraḥme'elite or Arabian Asshur.

This, then, is our result thus far. All the names in *vv.* 2-4 have an Arabian, indeed most probably a N. Arabian reference. This is directly confirmed by the statement in *v.* 5, which should probably run thus—'These are the sons of Yepheth (Yaphleṭ?) in the land of Asshur-Yeraḥme'el, according to their clans' (*Gloss on 'Assh. Yer.,'* Arāb; *on benê Ḥam* (*v.* 6), benê Yarḥam).

We now come to the sons, grandsons, and great-

grandsons of Ḥam (*vv.* 6, 7, 20). The first two on the list are *Kūsh* (כוש) and *Miṣraim* or *Miṣrim* (*v.* 6). Although it would be plain, even without extant evidence, that the Hebrews must have been acquainted with Ethiopia and Egypt, yet the context (of J and P combined) forbids us to identify כוש and מצרים with these regions. In fact, Gen. x. 6 is one of a number of passages in which (as a careful examination shows) these names must refer to countries in N. Arabia.[1] Let me venture to speak first of Kūsh. I can see no occasion to suppose with Jastrow (who develops an idea of Winckler) that the name is 'indefinitely used for the extreme south without a sharp differentiation between S. Arabia and the corresponding district on the African coast.'[2] Surely the existence of a Kūs or Kūsh in N. Arabia is sufficiently proved by the use of Ku-u-si and Meluḫḫa (from Yeraḥme'el?) together as a designation of N. Arabia. There may, indeed, have been a S. Arabian Kūsh, but why need we introduce it here? [On the subject of an Arabian Kūsh see, further, Winckler, *Hibbert Journal*, ii. 577 *f.*, and especially his *Muṣri*, ii. (1898), and *KAT*[3], p. 144 *f.*; also *E. Bib.*, 'Cush'; *Bible Problems*, pp. 167, 178-182; Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, pp. 315-317, 463 *ff.*]

Can we throw any fresh light on the name Kūsh? I venture to think that we can. Our study of names such as שכם, משך, דמשק, רב שקה, כשדים, כסלחים, פינחס leads to the conclusion that שך, שק, כש, כס, when they occur as elements in proper names, are really corrupt fragments of אשחר, a name which, though the MT. acknowledges it only in 1 Chr. ii. 24, iv. 5 (in Calebite genealogies), is still recognisable in many passages underneath the corrupt, traditional text, and which, in the MT. itself (see on *v.* 11, ii. 14), has often been modified into אשור, sometimes also into נשור, חור[י]ש, שור, and זרח. As we have already seen (on ii. 14), the name Ashḥur is the designation of a part or parts of Arabia—sometimes of a district bordering on Palestine, sometimes of a more distant region. This sug-

[1] See *e.g.* on ii. 13. It should be mentioned that in Am. ix. 7 כשים has most probably come from כשרים = שכרם, 'Ashḥur-arām'

[2] Article in *Proc. of Amer. Philos. Soc.*, 1903, p. 187, note 2. Cp. Winckler, *KAT*[3], pp. 137, 144.

gests the inquiry whether כוש, though complete in itself, and not merely an element in a compound name, may not, like the names חֹר and חור, be a corrupt fragment of אשחור. It does not follow that Kūsh and Ashḥur have the same geographical significance; only that Kūsh was an Ashḥurite region, a fact which is in itself highly probable. The intermediate forms between כוש and אשחור would be אכוש and אחרש; in 1 S. xxi. 10, etc., we actually find אכיש as the name of a 'Philistine' king. Cp. also קיש, כושיה (from כוש-ירחו), אלקוש (from רחמאל-כוש?), עשק, עכסה, שישק. It now becomes clear how the wife of Moses can be at once a Kushite (E) and a daughter of Yithro (J), for יתרו probably comes from אשתר, a synonym of אשחר. Nor need we wonder that a N. Arabian Ashḥur or Asshur is not mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions; for Kūs is mentioned there, and Kūs, according to our theory, comes from Aḥrash = Ashḥur. (It is worth noticing that in Isa. xi. 11 *b* Kūsh occurs, not directly after Miṣrim, but between Ṣarephath (Pathros) and Yeraḥme'el (Elam); see above, p. 165, note 4.)

Next to Kush comes מצרים, not as if the latter were inferior to its companion, but probably for euphony. How is it to be pronounced? Miṣraim? But we shall find in studying *vv.* 13-14 that J, at any rate, did not think of Miṣraim (*i.e.* Egypt), but of Miṣrim, *i.e.* the N. Arabian Muṣri, the existence of which was made out by Glaser and Winckler together with that of the Arabian Kush. As Prof. Kittel well says,[1] 'the existence of Muṣri cannot be contested.' Doubtless a larger bulk of external evidence would be more satisfactory, but the internal evidence is abundant. And what is Muṣri? According to Winckler,[2] Muṣri is the name of the land which, on the south, adjoins Judæa and Edom, and stretches towards the Sinaitic peninsula and Arabia, and whose northern boundary is the naḥal Muṣri (Assyrian) or נַחַל מִצְרַיִם (xv. 18). The exact position of the נ׳ מ׳ is disputable. Suffice it to say that the realm of the king of Miṣrim must apparently have been extensive,[3]

[1] *KAT*[(3)], p. 143. Hommel, however, makes Moṣar (Muṣur or Muṣri) synonymous with Midian (*Vier neue Landschaftsnamen*, p. 277).

[2] *Neue kirchliche Zeitschr.* xiv. (1903), p. 574.

[3] See *Crit. Bib.* p. 336.

and that he was most probably a vassal of the king of Ashḥur (in the larger sense of the word),[1] which does not, however, prevent him from joining the king of Kush (*i.e.* of Ashḥur in a narrower sense) in a struggle with the 'great king' of Asshur or Ashḥur.[2] The view that מצרים is equivalent to the N. Arabian Muṣri, or, at any rate, includes this Muṣri, is the key to a large number of O.T. passages.[3] I say 'includes,' because of Winckler's and Hommel's suggestion that Miṣraim, if we accept this vocalisation, may include both Egypt and N.W. Arabia, in fact all the country over which the so-called Pharaoh claimed the suzerainty. That I myself am convinced of the correctness of this view would be too much to say.[4] There are, at any rate, many more cases in which מצרים, in the mind of the original writer, stood for the N. Arabian Muṣri than for Egypt.

One of the chief difficulties felt by students in accepting this theory is the unproductive character of the soil in the N. Arabian border-land at present. We have no reason, however, in spite of Prof. Ed. Meyer, to believe that it was equally unproductive in a remote antiquity. The wâdys were not always dry, nor was irrigation deficient, and the culture, both moral and physical, of the land and its inhabitants was very different from what it is to-day. The commentator is not to be blamed for the inevitable *lacunæ* in his information. The Hebrew texts (see *e.g.* the occurrences of מצרים in Gen.-Ex.) compel him to assume much that needs confirmation from other sources, unless, indeed, we prefer to cover over exegetical problems of the first magnitude.

Another form of 'Miṣrim' is the singular form מְצוֹר;[5] see 2 K. xix. 24 (Isa. xxxvii. 25), Isa. xix. 6, Mic. vii. 12. A shortened form of this is צוֹר; see Am. i. 9, Ezek. xxvi. 2, etc., xxvii. 2, etc., xxviii. 2, etc., Ps. lx. 9. See, further,

[1] See *Crit. Bib.* p. 382. [2] *Ibid.* p. 384.

[3] Ed. Meyer actually says (p. 457) that Winckler has not pointed out a single O.T. passage in which the equation מצרים = the asserted N. Arabian Muṣri (except those referring to נחל מ׳) can even be discussed. My own *Bible Problems* gives a sufficient answer to such a strange misstatement. See reference further on.

[4] מצרים may have developed out of מצרָם. A locative form, not a dual.

[5] The pointing מָצוֹר is due to a faulty conjectural interpretation of the word as 'fortification' or the like (cp. Mic. vii. 12, 𝔊 and A.V.).

E. Bib., 'Mizraim'; Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, pp. 161-178; Winckler, *KAT*(3), pp. 146 *f.*; *Muṣri*, *Meluḫḫa*, *Ma'în*; 'North Arabia and the Bible,' *Hibbert Journal*, April 1904; Hommel, *Aufsätze*, pp. 302-312; Ed. König, *Fünf neue arabische Landschaftsnamen*, etc., pp. 19-38; A. Noordtzij, 'Muṣri,' *Theol. Tijdschr.* 1906, pp. 379, 454 (like König, highly controversial and unprogressive); Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, pp. 455 *ff.* (chiefly on cuneiform texts; weak on the O.T. side). To what is said in *E. Bib.*, 'Mizraim,' § 1, on the forms and meaning of מצרים, I would now add a reference (from Johns, *Ass. Deeds*, iii. 473) to the Assyrian name Muṣûrai and to the Moabite royal name Muṣuri (temp. Esarhaddon). 'I am not convinced,' says Mr. Johns, 'that it necessarily means "Egyptian."' Truly, it is not less unnatural to explain it 'Egyptian' than to give this meaning to מצרי in 2 S. xxiii. 21 (see *Crit. Bib.*) and 1 Chr. ii. 34.

Puṭ and *Canaan* form a couple, like Kush and Miṣrim. The view of Jastrow (pp. 188, 190 *f.*) that 'Canaan' is a later addition, due to the hostility existing between Hebrews and Canaanites, has no other basis but the erroneous theory that the 'Ḥamites' represent 'accursed' nations. Of course, if Puṭ means the land called Punṭ (*i.e.* the Abyssinian and Somali coast)[1] in the Egyptian inscriptions, 'Canaan' cannot rightly be coupled with it. But is this identification defensible? According to Ezek. xxx. 5, Puṭ was among the supporters of מצרים; now it cannot be asserted that Punṭ ever supplied Egypt with warriors. It is more plausible to compare Puṭu-yaman, a city whose prince was an ally of Amaris, king of Egypt. It is true, we require not a city, but a region. But may not a city and a region bear the same name? Yaman is, to us, a well-known name (see on 'Yavan,' *v.* 2); it means 'Yeraḥme'el.'[2] So too in Ex. vi. 25 (see note) Puṭiel is most probably a Yeraḥme'elite or N. Arabian name. The context certainly favours this view, for פינחס, or rather פנחס, most probably represents נֶפְתֹּחַ־חס, *i.e.* Nephtoaḥ of Ḥas (= Ashḥur). Puṭ is therefore to be regarded as a N. Arabian name. And the same result follows if we look at the names compounded with Puṭ in

[1] So W. M. Müller, *E. Bib.*, 'Egypt,' § 48.

[2] Otherwise Winckler, *AOF* i. 512 *f.* See, further, *E. Bib.*, 'Put.'

Assyrian deeds,[1] and at those with which Puṭ is grouped in various O.T. passages.[2] Among the former let us notice Puṭi-Ḥuru and Puṭi-Mâni, where Ḥuru is probably from Ashḥur, and Mâni from Yamâni (Yerahme'elite), and among the latter, Kush, Lud, and ערב (pronounce ʿArāb) in Ezek. xxx. 5, and Paras and Lud in Ezek. xxvii. 10. We have therefore to find some well-known (N. Arabian) name out of which Puṭ may have been corrupted. Such a name would be פרת (=אפרת, see on ii. 14 *b*, xv. 18), also פלט (1 Chr. ii. 47, Calebite) = פלת (see on Num. xvi. 1).

If Puṭ is really N. Arabian, the presumption is that Canaan (Kenaʿan) is so too, *i.e.* that originally the latter name did not mean Palestine, or any part of Palestine. But let us put this aside for the moment, and ask ourselves how it has come about that 'Canaan' (understood in the traditional sense) is represented as a son of Ḥam, and a younger brother of Kush and Miṣr(a)im. Various answers have been given (see *e.g.* Driver, *Genesis*, p. 118; Jastrow, *Hamites and Semites*, p. 188); but who would say that any one of them is more than provisional?

It is only a deeper study of the names in the O.T. itself which will enable us to give a more satisfactory answer. It may be true that the Kinaḫḫi of the Tell el-Amarna Tablets corresponds to the Rutenu of the Egyptian inscriptions.[3] But this does not permit the conjecture that Canaan *originally* meant Syria, and that the combination of Canaan with Miṣr(a)im is to be explained by the political subordination of Syria and Palestine to Egypt. For the name Canaan is most probably much earlier than the Amarna Tablets, and is one of the names of districts and tribes or clans which the Arabians took with them in their northern migrations (cp. *Enc. Brit.*[10], 'Canaan').

The identification of 'Canaan' with the Kinaḫḫi or (the fuller form) Kinaḫni[4] may be safely accepted. Kinaḫni

[1] See Johns, *Ass. Deeds*, iii. 165 *f.*

[2] See Nah. iii. 9, Jer. xlvi. 9, Ezek. xxvii. 10, xxx. 5, xxxviii. 5. On the names with which Puṭ is here grouped see *Crit. Bib.* and *E. Bib.*

[3] E. Meyer, *Glossen* (on the Am. Tablets), pp. 67, 68 note 1 (1897); cp. Prašek, *Exp. Times*, xi. 207.

[4] Halévy, *REJ*, avril-juin 1890, p. 207.

evidently corresponds to כנען, and Kinaḫḫi to Χνᾶ, *i.e.* כְּנַע, the name under which Phœnicia is personified by Philo of Byblus. To explain כנע and כנען as 'lowland'[1] is out of the question. But we can most certainly venture to say that, on grounds of analogy, כנען is to be grouped with עקן, עכן, יעקן, ענק, יקנעם, קין, קינן, all of which, as a strict textual criticism shows, are to be regarded as of N. Arabian origin. Such an origin for כנען is further suggested by Num. xiii. 29 *b*, where underneath the present text we may recognise a statement that the Canaanites 'dwell by Yaman and beside the Yarḥon'; by Ezek. xvii. 4, where 'the land of Can.' is ‖ to 'Arab-Yeraḥme'el (MT. is wrong); and by Zeph. ii. 5, where 'Canaan' is ‖ to 'the land of the Pĕlištim' (cp. on *v.* 14). Note also that in ix. 18 (revised text) 'Ḥam' (*i.e.* Yeraḥme'el') is defined as 'Arab-Canaan.'

It is still the Priestly Writer who gives us the names of five 'sons' of Kush (*v.* 7). The first is *Seba* (סְבָא), who is mentioned in Isa. xliii. 3 with Miṣr(a)im and Kush), and in Ps. lxii. 10 with Sheba (see on *v.* 28). See below, on 'Sabta.'—Then comes *Havilah* (חוילה), which we have already met with in the Paradise-story (see on ii. 11), and shall find again in J's list of the Yoḳṭanites (*v.* 29), very near 'Sheba,' also in an account of the territory of the Ishmaelites (xxv. 18, J). It has, of course, been noticed with surprise that *v.* 29 makes 'Havilah' a Shemite, whereas in *v.* 7 he appears as a Hamite. According to Jastrow (p. 180) this inconsistency is to be illustrated by the habits of the later Arabic historians, who are accustomed to put different traditions side by side, the second tradition being introduced by the word *kîla*, 'others say.' The explanation, however, is incomplete. 'Shem' and 'Ḥam' are, as we have seen, different names for the same imaginary personage; Ishmael (Shem) and Yeraḥme'el (Ḥam) are synonymous. 'Havilah' itself is a pure Yeraḥme'elite name; just as יון comes from ימן (see on *v.* 2), so חוילה comes from חמילה

[1] So still Hommel, *Gr.* p. 242. But see G. F. Moore, *Proc. Amer. Or. Soc.*, 1890, pp. lxvii. *ff.* Winckler (*KAT*[3], p. 181) remarks, 'At present there is no prospect of explaining the name etymologically.' But it is something to be able to group it rightly.

(cp. חמול, xlvi. 12), *i.e.* יוחמאל with the feminine ending.[1] *Sabta* and *Sabteka* may be shortened forms of the same name, a compound of סב (= סבא) and כתא, perhaps = מעכת (cp. on 'Kittim,' *v.* 4).

Ra'mah (רַעְמָה) and his sons. Can we illustrate this name? The reference is admittedly Arabian (see *E. Bib.*, *s.v.*), but the origin is still obscure. The essential is to place the name in the right group. The nearest parallel is ראמת (Dt. iv. 43). We may also compare the personal name רעמיה (Neh. vii. 7), which corresponds to רעליה[2] in Ezra ii. 2. All these are derivatives of ארם; the appendix יה in רעליה has come from יה = יו[ר]חו. Ra'mah's two sons are *Sheba* (שְׁבָא) and Dedan. The critics have, naturally enough, been puzzled at the repetition of 'Sheba' in *v.* 28 (Yoḳṭanites); cp. Jastrow, p. 180. Shall we say that there were two Shebas, a northern (see on 1 K. x. 1) and a southern, and that the N. Arabian Sheba was a colony from the south? But why only two Shebas? and why a colony from the south.[3] Surely שבא is a derivative of שמע, and simply indicates an Ishmaelite or Yeraḥme'elite settlement. Observe that 'Sheba' and 'Dedan' occur again in xxv. 3 (note), and that in Ezek. xxxviii. 13 these names occur together with 'Tarshish,' *i.e.* Ashtar (= Ashḥur); see on *v.* 4. *Dedan* (דְּדָן), or perhaps דֹּדָן (see on 'Dodanim,' *v.* 4), is a region in N. Arabia. Cp. on xvi. 14, on Isa. xxi. 13, and on Ezek. xxvii. 15 *a*. Glaser (*Skizze*, ii. 393) thinks that the neighbourhood of Medîna is meant.

So far as we know, P had no more to say about the Ḥamites. The epilogue forms *v.* 20, the text of which has been harmonised with *v.* 5, and should be similarly restored. For ללש' בארצ' we should read בארץ ישמעאל (transposing), and for בגויהם, בני ירחם (gloss on בני חם).

[1] This gives us the key to חול, *v.* 23. No connexion with חוֹל, 'sand.' This spoils Glaser's explanation (*Skizze*, ii. 324).

[2] That רעל in רעליה represents ירחמאל = ארל = ערל can hardly be doubted. Cp. on אריאל, 2 S. xxiii. 20; ערל, 1 S. xvii. 36. יה is explained above.

[3] According to Hommel (*Gr.* p. 142) the Sabæans penetrated as far as S. Arabia in the eighth century B.C. from the N. Arabian Djôf (the Aribi of the cuneiform inscriptions, and the 'Yareb' of Hosea). I agree with him that the 'queen of Sheba' was a N. Arabian princess.

It has been thought strange that P's list of the sons of Shem (*v.* 22) should begin with *Elam* (עילם). To explain this, some refer to the existence of a Semitic population in Elam (the famous Elam) in very early times, dependent on Babylonia, while others suggest that Elam may have been regarded as including Babylonia, which country was conquered by the 'Anzanite' lords of Susa and Elam; and, again, others (preferring more recent history) remind us that parts of Elam were annexed to Assyria by Sargon, or refer to the prominence of Elam in the Persian empire. It is, however, incorrect to suppose that there was only one Elam, and that P must have referred to the Elam with which we are familiar. A study of the other passages in which עילם occurs, notably Isa. xi. 11 (already referred to), Ezek. xxxii. 24, and Ezra ii. 7, 31, makes it evident that there was a עילם in the Ashhurite portion of N. Arabia,[1] and that it is referred to here. As to the origin of the name, we may—following many parallels—trace it either to ישמעאל or to ירחמאל (the names are equivalent); cp. on מלא, xxiii. 9; on עולם, xxi. 33; and on עמל, Judg. v. 26. Of course, the origin of popular corruptions like עילם was early forgotten; the name quickly obtained independent rights.

On Asshur (אַשּׁוּר) not much more need be said here. The name (also Ashḥur)[2] meets us again and again, both in a narrower and in a wider sense. The first to indicate a southern Asshur (Ashur) was the learned traveller Glaser, who was followed by Hommel.[3] Apart from the leading idea, I am myself independent of Hommel (see *Bible Problems*, pp. 182 *f.*, 262-270), and need not therefore consider Prof. König's far too confident criticisms (*op. cit.* pp. 1-19). Among the Asshur passages, note ii. 14, x. 11, xxi. 17 *b*, xxv. 3, 18, Isa. xix. 23-25, Ezek. xxiii. 5, 7, 9, etc., xxvii. 23, Zeph. ii. 13, Ezra ii. 31. In Zeph. *l.c.* note that Ṣāphōn (a region in N. Arabia; see pp. 30, 32) and

[1] The confidence of Cornill that Elam in Jer. xlix. 34 is Elymais is astonishing. Hommel (*Gr.* p. 248) suspects an E. Arabian Elam to be referred to in Gen. x. 22.

[2] 'Shur' and 'Ḥur' are shortened forms of 'Asshur' and 'Ashḥur' respectively. 'Ashḥur' has probably come from 'Asshur-yeraḥ' (cp. Ashdod).

[3] *AHT*, pp. 239-246.

Asshur are parallel, and in Ezra that 'the other Elam' should be 'Elam of Asshur' (a phrase which speaks volumes), also that the next names in the list are חרים = ירחם and לד = גלעד (the southern Gilead).

Arpakshad (אַרְפַּכְשַׁד). A controversy between Hommel and myself[1] left the former as strongly convinced as before that the name meant '(Ur-the-) of Chaldeans.' To me it seemed more likely that ארפכ was the Hebraised name of the Assyrian province Arbaḫa or (*KB* ii. 88 *f.*) Arabḫā. In this case שד would be a fragment of כשד, *i.e.*, as most think, Chaldæa (see on xxii. 22). *V.* 22 would then run thus, 'The sons of Shem; Elam and Asshur and Arpak-kesed and Lud and Aram.' *V.* 24 is admittedly a redactor's insertion, and the form Arpakshad might also come from the redactor, who misunderstood Arpak-kesed in *v.* 22. The true reading in xi. 10 *ff.* would, in this case, be כשד,[2] which the redactor (who had already miswritten the compound name in x. 22) turned into ארפכשד. The textual phenomena, however, which have come to light since 1897 suggest a different explanation. It is clear that עֵרֶב, 'Arabia,' may be miswritten פרא (xvi. 12, Hos. viii. 9), פרע (Gen. xli. 50), and עפר[3] (Prov. viii. 26), and that כשדים has often come from כשרם, a popular distortion of אשחֵר־ארם (see on xi. 31). If consistency is any virtue, we cannot help explaining ארפכשר as a corruption of 'עֵרֶב־כשר, where 'כשר is a short way of writing כשרם.[4] Thus ארפכשר and אור כשדים are different corruptions of the same original. Cp. on xi. 31 (Ur-kasdim) and xxii. 22 (Kesed), and *E. Bib.*, cols. 5231-5234.—The next name is *Lūd* (לוד; Sam. לד). Does P here make a sudden spring to Asia Minor? Or

[1] *Academy*, 17th Oct. 1896; *AHT*, pp. 212, 297; *Expositor*, Feb. 1897, pp. 145-148 (against Hommel). Prof. Hommel now explains, 'boundary of the Chaldæans' (*Gr.* p. 184, note 1).

[2] Gunkel, who finds this theory attractive, remarks that the reading 'Kesed' would harmonise well with the statement in xi. 31 that Teraḥ migrated from Ur-Kasdim. This is true, but the reading which underlies Arpakshad harmonises perfectly with that form which the *corrupt* reading Ur-Kasdim has most probably developed.

[3] See pp. 38, 70.

[4] For other views see Del. *Paradies*, p. 256; Hommel, *AHT*, pp. 212, 294-298; *Exp. Times*, xiii. 285, and *Gr.* pp. 184, 244; Cheyne, *Expositor*, Feb. 1897, pp. 145 *ff.*, and *E. Bib.*, cols. 318 *f.*

was he really ignorant of the situation of Lydia (Ass. *Luddu*)? Or can Jensen and Jeremias be right in tracing Lūd to Lubdu, the name of a region between the Upper Tigris and the Euphrates? No; neither Luddu or Lubdu is the original of Lūd. Analogy (cp. Ḥur, Mash, Ḥul, Ram) indicates that Lūd is most probably a fragment of some longer name. Not, however, of Rutenu, a well-known early Egyptian designation of Palestine and Syria (Wiedemann), but, as the context suggests, and as is confirmed by Ezra ii. 33 (Neh. vii. 37), Neh. xi. 35, 1 Chr. viii. 12,[1] of some Arabian border-name, and most probably of גלעד, *i.e.* that southern Gilead which gives us so much to do in explaining some parts of the O.T. (see on 'Ludim,' *v.* 13, and on xxxi. 21). For לעד = לוד compare גלעד = גדול, *v.* 21, xv. 18.

Aram (אֲרָם). Is this the great Aramæan people which spread over the N.E. region as far as Mesopotamia? It is no doubt plausible. But the context, strictly examined, is adverse to this view. Observe (1) that in Num. xxiii. 7 ארם is || to הררי קדם; now קדם in such passages cannot, so far as I can see, mean 'the east.'[2] Balaam, whose home was in Pethor, could not, if Pethor is really = Ass. Pitru, be said to have come from 'the east.' In all such passages a N. Arabian region is referred to; קדם has arisen out of ירחם = רקם (see on xxix. 1). Observe also (2) that in xxii. 2 'it is strange' (as Driver, p. 223, remarks) 'to find him (Aram) subordinated to the unknown Kemuel,' or rather, from our point of view, it is very naturally said that Aram had the closest possible connexion with 'Kemuel,' *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el.[3] And (3) that in xxv. 20 'Bethuel' and 'Laban' are both called אֲרַמִּי. Now בתואל is certainly to be grouped with אתבעל and תובל, both of which come from ישמעאל. The truth is that ארם is one of the old names adopted by P, and

[1] In all these passages לוד (presumably = לוד) is mentioned with אונו or אנו, a name which is certainly N. Arabian (see on xli. 50, Ezra, *l.c.*, Neh. vi. 2).

[2] Ed. Meyer, who knows of only one Aram, and is not as clear as could be wished about Ḳedem, naturally prefers to read אֶדֶם for אֲרָם (so Hommel).

[3] As we shall see (on xxii. 21) אבי ארם comes from עבר ארם, *i.e.* ערב א', 'Aramæan Arabia,' a gloss on קמואל.

means a large part of the N. Arabian border-land. For the formation of the name, cp. שם from ישמעאל (note on ix. 18).

V. 23. The 'sons' of Aram. *Uz* (עוץ). A number of identifications have been offered. Gunkel, for instance, offers cuneiform authority for locating Uz (Ûṣ) near Palmyra. The Biblical data are hopelessly conflicting, which ought to incite us to examine the text more closely (see *E. Bib.* 'Uz'). We know that Job, a typical wise man, was of the land of Uz (Job i. 1); also that he was one of the sons of Ḳedem (*v.* 3), a name which is plainly a corruption of Reḳem, *i.e.* Yarḥam (cp. on 'Aram'). Uz is also mentioned as the eldest 'son' of Nahor, Abraham's brother (xxii. 21), and as the grandson of Seir the Ḥorite (xxxvi. 28). Evidently 'Uz' is a corruption of some N. Arabian name, but of which?—חול, a Yeraḥme'elite clan (see on חוילה, *v.* 7; אביחיל, Num. iii. 35).—גתר. According to Marquart (*ZATW*, 1885, p. 155), from Aramaic גְּתָר, *i.e.* גְּשׁוּר. —מש. A connexion with the name of a mountain, whether the 'mons Masius' or the Mâšu (see Jensen, *KB* vi. 1, p. 576; Zimmern, *KAT*[3], p. 573; Jastrow, *RBA*, p. 489) is most improbable. Either a mutilated form of משך, 𝔊 *μοσοχ* (so 1 Chr. i. 17), for which see on *v.* 2; or to be explained as משא, *v.* 30. The Sam. here reads משא.

V. 31. Epilogue. 'These are the sons of Shem according to their clans.' Then continue 'in the land of Ishmael'—'בארץ ישמ; and at the end correct בגויהם as in *v.* 5, etc., a mistaken interpolation from *v.* 32.

V. 32. Final epilogue. בגויהם, *i.e.* בני ירחם, Yarḥamites or Yeraḥme'elites, a gloss on בני נח. In a wide but strictly correct sense all the 'sons of Noaḥ' were Yeraḥme'elites of N. Arabia. This must be taken in connexion with the closing words in their true form, viz. 'in Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el' (see on *v.* 1 *b*).

We now pass to the Yahwistic Table (J), putting aside all questions as to its original form and subsequent development. The first problem which concerns us is that of Nimrod. How strange it is that so much should be said about one of the genealogical figures, and one only! How strange, too, that 'Nimrod,' the real or supposed representative of Babylonia and Assyria, should be made a

Kushite, *i.e.* a Ḥamite! Surely, if the references to Egypt usually supposed to exist in the earlier historical narratives are correct, the Yahwist had quite as much opportunity of learning about Egyptain as about Babylonian and Assyrian cities. And if we further hold with Jastrow (p. 205) that the Babylonians and Assyrians were made 'Ḥamites,' because Ḥam, according to J, takes the place of the 'accursed' Canaan, we cannot but find this very perplexing, considering the direct or indirect indebtedness of the culture of Israel to that of Babylonia. It has therefore been suggested that the redactor may have confused Kush = Ethiopia (in P) and Kush = the Kassites who early conquered Babylonia (see *E. Bib.*, 'Cush,' § 1; 'Nimrod,' § 2).[1]

If, however, we look closely at the account of 'Nimrod,' we shall see that he is not represented solely as a conqueror, but also—and indeed especially—as a great founder of cities. 'Moreover, the difficulties connected with the names of the cities and with the phrase גִּבֹּר צַיִד remain, and as a point of method we ought first of all to seek to clear up these names in the light of probable conclusions attained elsewhere in the criticism of traditional names.'[2]

Let us take this phrase (in *v.* 9) first. Assuming it to mean 'a mighty hunter,' some have supposed that *v.* 9 has been brought from some other context.[3] But surely the redactor would not have accepted a 'parenthesis' (Driver's word) in which גבר was used in a new sense (expressing relation), while in *v.* 8 גבר clearly means 'a hero.' If, then, גבר in *v.* 9 can only mean 'a hero,' ציד which follows must be corrupt; it is most plausible to regard it as a corruption of עריץ.[4] It is true, this undermines the conjecture of the connexion of Nimrod with Gilgamesh, the legendary hunter-king of Uruk,[5] perhaps of solar-mythical origin, which has

[1] This view is now held by Holzinger (p. 101), Ed. Meyer (p. 208, note 1), and doubtfully by Gunkel (pp. 78 *f.*).

[2] *E. Bib.*, 'Nimrod,' § 3.

[3] See *e.g. Oxf. Hex.* ii. 16; Gunkel, p. 75; Driver (*ad loc.*), 'a parenthesis.'

[4] The alternative is to read קצין, 'judge, general, prince.'

[5] 'Uruk' generally taken to be the Erech of *v.* 10 (but see below). The four legendary achievements of Gilgamesh are his conquest of Uruk, his victory over Ḫumbaba, king of Elam, his killing of the divine bull,

attracted several scholars (including Gunkel, Jensen, and to some extent Zimmern). But if this connexion were real, we should expect the name 'Nimrod' to have a plausible explanation from Babylonian, and such an explanation adapted to the Hebrew context I cannot find.[1]

Next, let us attack the problem of 'Nimrod.' The name, to a Hebrew ear, may have suggested 'rebellion,' but this does not help the critic, for all these early names have been worn down and assumed new forms. Nor does Mic. v. 5 suggest any promising solution. 'To the later age,' remarks Gunkel, 'Nimrod was the hero of Asshur (Assyria); Asshur is called "Nimrod's land," Mic. v. 5.' But I am afraid that Gunkel is not exacting enough as a textual critic. It is true that the special commentators on Micah are equally disappointing on Mic. v. 4, 5; it has not been observed that זה שלום is a gloss, and that שלום has come from ישמעאל (see on שלם, xxxiii. 18). The gloss therefore means, 'this is Ishmael,' and refers to אשור which follows. Now 'Asshur' and 'Ishmael' are synonymous terms for the same region in N. Arabia, and נמרד, as *v.* 5 shows, is parallel to it. Two possibilities are open to us, for I cannot see a connexion with 'Marduk' (Sayce, Wellh.) to be at all indicated, Nimrod not being a solar hero. (1) If we hold that 𝔊's form Νεβρωδ (נברד) is likely to be nearer to the original form, we may plausibly trace it to בנדד, a modification of ברדד, well known as a N. Arabian name (*KB* ii. 222 *f.*; cp. Winckler, *KAT*, pp. 133 *f.*, note 1.[2] Or (2), perhaps more

and his strangling of the lion. Nimrod's warlike achievements, however, far exceed those of Gilgamesh. See, further, *E. Bib.*, 'Nimrod,' § 2; 'Cainites,' § 6; A. Jeremias, *Izdubar-Nimrod* (1891), and *ATAO* (1904), pp. 158 *f.*; G. Smith, the Assyriologist, *TSBA* i. 205, etc.; Driver, *Genesis*; Gunkel, *Schöpfung*, p. 146.

[1] I cannot recognise as such A. Jeremias's explanation, 'babylonisiert *nâmir-uddu*, d.h. glänzendes Licht' (*ATAO*, *l.c.*). Nor can I possibly approve Jensen's suggestion (*Das Gilgamesch-Epos*, i. 87, note 1) that 'Nimrod' may come from Namurd, underlying a name given to the god of light and of the chase (provisionally called Ninib) in the later Babylonian period (*Babylonian Expedition*, Hilprecht, x., pp. xviii. *f.*, 8 *f.*), '*-n-w-sch-t.* How unnatural!

[2] The form may have come from ערב־דד, 'Arabia of Dad' (see on xxxvi. 35), 'Hadad, son of Bedad.' Cp. ברזלי from ערב־ישמ', a solution of an old problem which needs a thoroughly candid consideration.

probably, נמרד may have come from נמרך, miswritten for רנמן, *i.e.* רחמן, a popular modification of ירחמאל (מן frequently represents מאל); cp. on 'Nisrok,' 2 K. xix. 37. 'Nimrod' is therefore neither a Libyan-Egyptian[1] nor a Babylonian, but a Yerahme'elite, *i.e.* N. Arabian hero.[2] That he is fundamentally no mythical personage, whether Orion or the sun, I have shown elsewhere (see *E. Bib.*, 'Nimrod,' § 4).

Then follows, as most hold, a historical notice, to the effect that Nimrod was the first of the great empire-builders known to the Hebrews. But is this correct? Is 'he began to be a hero in the earth (or, land)' a natural Hebrew idiom? The nearest parallel is ix. 20, but that has already proved a stumbling-block, and, like iv. 26, must be corrupt. Note also that immediately after הוא החל וגו׳ comes another clause (*v.* 9 *a*) which is also introduced by הוא, and remember that we have already found that for גבר ציד we have to read גבר עריץ. Should we not also read ב׳ עריץ in *v.* 8, instead of גבר בארץ? It is now fair to suppose that the first גבר עריץ is an interpolation from *v.* 9, and that החל (cp. on iv. 26, ix. 20) should be ירחמאל. להיות may be either a redactional insertion, or a corruption of ירחמאל, originally, perhaps, a correction of החל. Thus *vv.* 8 and 9*a* become, 'And Kush begot Raḥman. [That is, Yeraḥme'el. He was an awe-inspiring hero לפני יהוה].'

And what can לפני יהוה mean? It is indeed an exegetical puzzle. Assuming that Nimrod was really represented as a hunter, critics have supposed that the phrase is purely ornamental, 'a great hunter even for God' (Del., Dillm., etc.), or, to give it more force, have paraphrased 'in defiance of God' (Budde), while Gunkel (*Gen.* p. 79) supposes that there may have been a narrative of Nimrod hunting while a god (not originally Yahweh) looked on, and perhaps even helped him. Evidently fresh light is needed; the greatest admirer of Dillmann must grant this. Now, there is a weird section of Ezekiel (already referred to for Asshur, Elam,

[1] So Ed. Meyer, after seventeen years, still holds with regard to Nimrod the hunter (*Die Israel.* pp. 448 *f.*).

[2] Cp. Jeremias, *ATAO*, p. 158, 'er ist ein Araber.' But see the context. He supposes that the conquests of this Arabian hero lay in the region of the Euphrates and the Tigris.

Meshek, and Tubal) in the course of which (xxxii. 27) we find this singular phrase—את־גבורים נפלים מערלים. Most explain this, 'with the heroes, the giants of old time' (reading מעולם), but a more penetrating criticism seems to have shown that the second and third words represent glosses on the first. נפלים is the word we find in vi. 4, Num. xiii. 33; it can be shown to be applied to a much-dreaded race of Yeraḥme'elite origin (see notes on those passages); most probably it has arisen out of לבנים = לפנים (Lapanites = Labanites). At any rate, it gave the necessary definiteness to גבורים, and it was itself explained (as if by an excess of zeal) by a further gloss ירחמאלים (miswritten מערלים). Now have we not the key to לפני? לפני should be pointed לִפָנֵי; it means 'Labanite'; and יהוה which follows has come from ירח', *i.e.* ירחמאל, as in Judg. xix. 1 (see *Crit. Bib.*) and many other passages, or rather ירחמאלי, a gloss. The statement respecting 'Nimrod' (Raḥman) therefore is simply that he was a formidable warrior, of the class referred to as Labanite or (*par excellence*) Yeraḥme'elite. The idea that 'when the Hebrews wished to describe a man as being a great hunter they spoke of him as "like Nimrod"' (Driver) would therefore seem to be mistaken. The popular saying was, 'Like Raḥman, a formidable hero [a Lapanite, Yeraḥme'el].' See further, on vi. 4.

But who, more particularly, was Raḥman? Is he an individual whose true name has disappeared, but who was remembered as the founder of Yeraḥme'elite greatness? Or is he not rather the 'heros eponymus' of the migratory Yeraḥme'elite race? The latter view is preferable. Each migration, each conquering band of N. Arabians, had a leader; these leaders were rolled by tradition into one, and became a single 'formidable hero,' who received, under one of its forms, the common name of his race, Yeraḥme'el. And what direction did those conquering expeditions take? There is evidence that the Arabian migrations spread very widely indeed. The founders of the Ḫammurabi dynasty in Babylonia were Arabians, and, as the names Ḫammurabi and Sumu-abi themselves suggest, Yeraḥme'elite (= Ishmaelite) Arabians,[1] while the Arabian origin of the

[1] See on v. 32, and cp. on 'Shemeber,' xiv. 2.

Phœnicians is plain from many of their names.[1] Still it may, in the first instance, be presumed that the districts referred to as conquered by the Yeraḥme'elites were near the southern border of Palestine. It is to this region that the early legends of Genesis thus far relate, and we may expect the statements of *vv.* 10-12 to refer to it also. Let us therefore now examine the ten names mentioned in the traditional text. These are—Bābel, Erech, Akkad, Kalneh, the land of Shinar, Asshur, Nineveh, Reḥoboth-'ir, Kelaḥ, Resen. Of these, 1-3, 6, 7, and 9 are supposed to have been identified, while the remaining four are admitted to be still obscure, even with the help of Assyriology. Let us take these four first, and see whether they show signs of belonging to any of those types of corruption which recur so frequently in the text of other O.T. writings.

Let us (*a*) begin with the riddle of *Shinar*, שנער, in the traditional text the name of the region in which the four cities first mentioned were situated. It is, from every point of view, bold to trace its origin to 'Sumer' (S. Babylonia). But it seems still bolder to connect it with the Šanḥar of the Amarna letters and the Sangara of the Egyptian inscriptions, and to suppose both these forms to be = Karduniasḥ, the Kassite name for Babylonia.[2] Those who have noted down a few of the recurrent types of corruption pointed out in *Crit. Bib.* (see especially pp. 210, 243, 407 *f.*) will recognise the true solution at once. Just as בשן comes from אבשן = שמן ערב = ישמעאל ע', so שנער comes from שמן ערב = ישמ' ע', 'Arabian Ishmael.' This will suit all the passages in which the name occurs (viz. x. 10, xi. 2, xiv. 1, 9, Josh. vii. 21,[3] Isa. xi. 11, Zech. v. 11, Dan. i. 2), if a keen and consistent criticism be applied also to the contexts. Note especially that in xiv. 1 the king of שנער is called by the compound name אמרפל, where אמר has come from ארם (*i.e.* the southern Aram = Yeraḥme'el), and that

[1] See p. 43, and elsewhere in 'Cosmogony.'

[2] Ed. Meyer (*Glossen*, see *E. Bib.*, 'Shinar'); so Hommel, *Gr.* p. 6; cp. pp. 257, note 2, 300. On the other side, see Winckler, *KAT*[(3)], p. 238. Cp. Pinches, in Hast. *DB* iv. 503 *b*, whose view is, I fear, no better than those which he rejects.

[3] Both אחת and אחר come from אשחר.

the names שנאב and שמאבר (*v.* 2) are, from the same point of view, no doubt corruptions of the same original as שנער.

(*b*) *Kalneh*, כלנה (Am. vi. 2; כלנו, Isa. x. 9), is also difficult;[1] Jensen would emend it into כלבה = Kullaba, an old Babylonian city.[2] But in Amos and Isaiah it is the conquest of city after city by the Asshurites in one of their invasions that is referred to. Similarly in Nah. iii. 8 we should perhaps read [מ]כלנו אמון (Calno of Amon, *i.e.* of Armon or Yerahme'el). The origin, however, of Kalneh or Kalno is not clear. Should we not read, for both forms, לבנה? 'Nimrod,' as we have seen, is called a Labanite.

(*c*) *Reḥoboth-ʿir* (רחבת עיר) should mean 'broad places of a city'; but how can this be right? Assyriologists generally equate the name with the *rêbit Ninâ* of the inscriptions. The uncertainty of this, however, has been candidly set forth by Mr. Johns (*E. Bib.*, col. 4029), and on this and other grounds we are amply justified in seeking light elsewhere. Now experience shows that עיר not unfrequently comes from יעיר = ירחמאל (see on xxiii. 10, xxxvi. 43), while Reḥob and Reḥoboth are familiar to us as names of places. One of the Reḥoboths (perhaps that in xxxvi. 37) seems to have been called 'Reḥoboth of Arabia.'

(*d*) *Resen* (רסן). A difficult name. Assyriology does not help us (*DB* iv. 229; *E. Bib.*, 'Resen,' § 1; cp. Nestle, *Exp. Times*, July 1904, p. 476). It is, however, plausible to suppose that it is miswritten for סנער, *i.e.* ישמעאל-ערב; cp. on שנער, *v.* 10, and on שׂניר (Dt. iii. 9), also סין, סיני, סנסנה (Josh. xv. 31), all from סמן = ישמעאל. This is confirmed by the gloss which follows. For underneath the improbable הוא העיר הגדולה[3] it is not hard to recognise הוא יעיר גלעד, which the redactor doubtless had before him, but failed to understand (יעיר = ירחמאל). Possibly, then, רסן (סנער) is rather a regional than a place name, at least if we are right in questioning ויבן in *v.* 11 *b* (see below).

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Calneh,' 'Calno'; Harper, *Amos and Hosea*, p. 144.

[2] *TLZ*, 1895, col. 510 (ap. Jeremias, *ATAO*, p. 164).

[3] This passage seems to have affected the form of Jonah iii. 3, 4. See *Crit. Bib.* p. 151, the statements of which, however, are not entirely correct. It would seem that in the original text (altered by the redactor) the phrase in Gen. x. 12, הוא ערב גלעד, was taken to refer to Nineveh.

Let us now turn to the place-names, which, according to a delightful opinion, have been successfully explained. (*a*) בָּבֶל. Few scholars doubt that, except in Ezra v. 13 and Neh. xiii. 6 (where it is supposed to mean the Persian kingdom), this very familiar name means 'Babylon.' But it is not less positively asserted that אשור always (except where the name is applied to the Babylonian, or the Persian, or the Græco-Syrian kingdom), means 'Assyria.' When, however, we consider the large number of double or even triple applications of the same name (*e.g.* Reḥoboth, Kush, Muṣri), we cannot assure ourselves that this is not a mere prejudice. The view here put forward again is that בבל was the name, or one of the names, of the chief city of the great Yeraḥme'elite empire called Asshur or Ashḥur, which included the smaller kingdoms on the S. Palestinian border; hence בבל and אשור can be used as equivalents.[1] An early legend connected with *this* בבל (certainly not with 'Babylon') is to be found in xi. 1-9, from which narrative it appears that another form of the name for the capital was either בלהה or בלע (see on xi. 8). In fact, internal evidence throws much more light on this subject than might be supposed. In Ezek. xxvii. 4, xxviii. 2, 8, the improbable reading בלב ימים should probably be emended into בבל ימנים 'Bābel of the Yamanites.' From Ezek. xxi. 24 (19), we, further learn that בבל was in the land of Asshur, for the impossible מארץ אחד should of course be מ' אשחר.[2] This is confirmed by Jer. li. 1, where לב קמי comes from בבל ירקם Bābel of Yarḳam (= Yarḥam), a gloss on בבל,[3] and by *v.* 41, where ששך (see p. 47) comes from אשכר = אשחר (or אש' ירחם), which is parallel to בבל; also by Jer. l. 1, 8, where בבל is parallel to ארץ כשדים, *i.e.* כשרם = אשחר אֶרֶם; by Isa. xlvii. 1, where בת בבל is parallel to בת כשדים, *i.e.* בת כשרם; and by Ps. cxxxvii. 7, 8, where בני אדום (ב' אֶרֶם?) is parallel to בת בבל. Note also that in Jer. xxv. 9 בבל is presented as the centre of the clans of צפון. Here, as often (see p. 50),

[1] See *Crit. Bib.* pp. 81 *f.*

[2] Cornill, following two MSS. of Kenn., *alters* into אחת. Cp. König, *Synt.* 318.

[3] ישבי (parallel to בבל) is a corruption of ישמעאל. ישב and יבש often represent ישמ'.

צפון does not mean 'north,' but is a dialectal form of צבעון = ישמ'. Bābel, then, is an Asshurite or Ishmaelite city, *i.e.* somewhere in N. Arabia, the ancient geography of which region is very little known.

(*b*) and (*c*) *Erech* (*Erek*, ארך) and *Akkad* (אכד). 'Erech' is generally identified with the Bab. *Uruk* (modern *Warka*); 'Akkad,' with the Agadè of the inscriptions, where the more ancient Sargon dwelt.[1] It is quite possible, however, that ארך and אכד are merely different ways of writing the same name. The gentilic ארכי in 2 S. xv. 32 points at any rate to a S. Palestinian connexion (cp. *Crit. Bib.* p. 289). אכר[י] in Am. v. 16 may come from ארכי, in the sense of 'sacred chanter.'[2] The origin may be אשכר (see above).

(*d*) *Asshur*, see p. 177.

(*e*) נינוה. It is highly plausible to think of the Assyrian Nineveh (Ninua, Ninâ); the redactor himself may indeed have done so. We are compelled, however, to question this view. Since 'Nimrod' must be a N. Arabian, we cannot well assign to him the foundation or even the conquest of Nineveh. Both here, and possibly in all the other passages in which the name occurs, נינוה (or rather some underlying name) must be the designation of a N. Arabian city. To prove this at length would require a critical study which would take us too far from Genesis (see, however, provisionally *Crit. Bib.* on the passages). What, then, is נינוה? How shall the name be accounted for? One explanation is given in *Crit. Bib.* pp. 151, 164, but a better one is forthcoming. נינוה has almost certainly been produced here and elsewhere by the dittographing of נ; the true form is יונה, from יָנָן, another form of יָמָן (= ירחמאל); see on *v.* 2. We shall find that the O.T., rightly read, continually joins Asshur and Yerahme'el, and the first in the list of the sons of Asher (whose name is a by-form of Asshur) happens to be ימנה (xlvi. 17).

(*f*) *Kalaḥ* (כלח), according to most, represents the Ass. Kalḫu (see Johns, *E. Bib.*, 'Calah'). Most probably, however, restoring one letter, we should read נסלח, which seems to be the fuller form of the place-name סלנה.

[1] See Hommel, *Gr.* p. 400.

[2] Cp. כמרים, 'priests,' probably from רכמים (see p. 62, note 1).

'Salecah' was a great commercial centre. See on xx. 16, and cp. on נסלחים, *v.* 14.

Only one more problem remains—that connected with ויבן. It is true, the building of cities might be expected in old traditions.[1] But why is nothing said of the building of cities in the 'land of Shinar'? And if Asshur was not originally a part of the kingdom of 'Nimrod,' why is no mention made of his conquest of this region, especially as he was an 'awe-inspiring warrior' (see on *v.* 9)? Should we not, therefore, for ויבן read וַיֵּדֶּ (*E. Bib.*, col. 3418)? Cp. xiv. 7.

Another nest of unsolved problems comes before us in *vv.* 13 *f.* If מצרים means Egypt, what can 'Ludim,' 'Anamim,' etc., mean? *Pathrūsīm* (פתרסים) has certainly been explained, with some degree of plausibility,[2] as = 'those of Upper Egypt.' It must, however, be admitted to be strange (1) that 'Pathros' should have a plural termination attached to it, (2) that 'Pathrusim,' thus explained, should rank as only fifth among the sons of Miṣraim, and (3) that 'Pathrusim' should be reckoned as a 'son' of Miṣraim at all. A full study of the passages referring to 'Pathros' (Isa. xi. 11, Jer. xliv. 1, 15, Ezek. xxix. 14, xxx. 14) leads to the conclusion that it was only by an ingenious redactor[3] that the connexion between the group of letters represented in MT. by פתרוס and a designation of a portion of Egypt was produced[4] (see further *E. Bib.*, 'Pathros'). The true reading in our passage is almost certainly צרפתים; the linking form is ספרתים (cp. on ספרת, Neh. vii. 57). Note that in the (as I hope) recovered original text of Jer. xlvi. 9

[1] Cp. the second of the Babylonian creation-stories (*KB* vi. 41-43).

[2] The difficulty in connecting 'Pathros' with Coptic *pto-rês*, 'land of the south,' is that the only evidence for the name 'Pathros' is derived from the MT. of the O.T., and from an inscription of Esar-haddon (*KAT*[2], pp. 335 *f.*), where that king is described as 'king of the kings of Mu-ṣur, Pa-tu-ri[?]-si and Ku-si.' Why should not all these names refer to N. Arabian regions? Ezek. xxix. 14 tells against the common theory, not in its favour (see *Crit. Bib.*).

[3] Certainly פתרוס and Παθουρης remind us forcibly of the 'Phaturites' in the western part of the Thebaid mentioned by Pliny.

[4] This must be qualified by the observation that in 𝔊 of Isa. xi. 11 the word corresponding to פתרוס is neither Παθουρης nor Παθωρης, but Βαβυλωνία.

צפתים[1] follows immediately on גלעדים (MT. inaccurately לודים תפשי). This result throws a fresh light on Balaam's Pethor, and on the obscure אספות of Eccles. xii. 11 (see p. 40, note 3).

Prof. W. Max Müller, however (*OLZ*, 1902, p. 471), gives up 'Pathrusim.' He does not indeed abandon the long current explanation of 'Pathros' as 'Upper Egypt,' but he wishes to omit 'Pathrusim' as an *inaccurate* gloss, and to look for the sons of Miṣraim, not *in* the Nile valley, but *beside* it, like the Libyans. Thus the Kasluḥim (cp. Luc.'s χασλωνιειμ) become the נסמנים (cp. Herod. iv. 172), and so on. Ingenious.

If, however, מצרים is to be read Miṣrim, and the Miṣrites to be located in N. Arabia, the list of names becomes much clearer. Take the first name, *Ludim* (לודים). It is commonly assumed that 'Ludim,' being a son of מצרים, must be different from the 'Lud' of *v.* 22. Gunkel's comment on the name is, 'Named beside Egypt and Ethiopia in Ezek. xxx. 5 and Jer. xlvi. 9, otherwise unknown.' In Ezek. xxx. 5, however, it is not לודים but לוד.[2] Stade (*Akad. Reden*, pp. 140 *f.*) and W. M. Müller would change לודים into לובים. Against this, however, it may be urged that לובים and the parallel misunderstood form להבים are most probably (like לודים) corruptions of a longer ethnic. The N. Arabian theory gives us a clue to the problem. See on *v.* 22.—*Anamim* (ענמים) which follows is 'a not well-known people' (Ges.-Buhl). Yet no great experience is required to produce the correction מענים, a name equivalent to Meʿūnīm in Ezra ii. 50 (mentioned beside Nephisim in the list of Nethinite or Ethanite families), and to Meʿōnenīm in Judg. ix. 37; the common original of all these names is ישמעאלים.

We next meet with the *Lehabim* (להבים), referred to above. No doubt, להב, like הבל (iv. 2) and בלה in בלהה (xxix. 29), comes from ירחמאל; cp. on חבלים, Ezek. xlvii. 13, Ps. xvi. 9.—*Naphtuḥim* (נפתחים), according to

[1] צפת is an abridged form of צרפת (see *E. Bib.*, 'Zephath,' 'Zarephath').

[2] Stade thinks that לוד was only inserted to produce an assonance with פוט.

Erman (*ZATW*, 1890, pp. 118 *f.*) is an old corruption of פתמחים, 'those of the north-land.' But the parallel form (as Erman regards it), פתרסים, has been shown to have no reference to any part of Egypt. Let us then apply the N. Arabian key. 𝔊 gives Νεφθαλειμ. May not the common original both of נפתחים and of נפתלים be נפתוח (cp. on 'Nephtoah,' Josh. xv. 9)? This may have been shortened into נפת (see on נפות דור, Josh. xi. 2), to which a formative ל was attached (נפתל); see on xxx. 8.

Kasluḥim (כסלחים), says Prof. Francis Brown,[1] is 'just as obscure' as Anamim. But Anamim has revealed its secret. There is therefore good hope for 'Kasluḥim.' It is a compound name like שכ[ר]ם. Both names (Kasl. and Shakram) are, in fact, etymologically equivalent, which of course would not justify us in saying that they were also equivalent geographically. כס is a fragment of אסכר (cp. above, on בבל, end) = אשחר; cp. perhaps עכסה, Josh. xv. 16. לח has the same origin as לחי in Judg. xv. 9, *i.e.* is = ירחמאל. כסלח should probably be restored for כלח in *v.* 11, also perhaps in Judg. v. 15 (for קשלח), in Isa. xxxiii. 18 (for שקל), and in Am. vii. 4 (for החלק). The place-names סלכה and שלחים, too, are to be grouped with כסלח.

As to *Kaphtorim*, כפתרים, there is a tendency to identify 'Kaphtor' with Crete.[2] A thorough textual criticism, however, seems to me strongly adverse to this view. See Am. ix. 7, where the parallel names are מצרים (*i.e.* the N. Arabian Muṣri) and קיר (*i.e.* Ashḥur); Jer. xlvii. 4, where the Pelishtim are said to be the 'remnant of *'I-kaphtor'* (read, agreeably to parallels, Arab-kaphtor); also Dt. ii. 23, where 'the Kaphtorim who came out of Kaphtor' (but see *ad loc.*) are parallel to 'the benê Esau who dwelt in Seir (Ashḥur?)' in *v.* 23; and lastly Isa. xi. 14, where 'kaphtor-pelishtim' (so read, not *katheph*) is parallel to 'benê Reḳem,' *i.e.* the Yeraḥme'elites).[3] Further light is thrown on Kaphtor if we may combine 'Kaphtorim' with 'Kerēthim.' The Kereth-

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Geography,' § 15.

[2] Cp. Sayce, *HCM*[(3)], p. 173; *Exp. Times*, Oct. 1900, p. 28; Noordtzij, *De Filistijnen*, 1905, pp. 29, 39; Francis Brown, *E. Bib.*, 'Geography,' § 12 *b.*

[3] ימה should be ימנה, 'towards Yaman' (see on *v.* 2).

ites were certainly of N. Arabia (1 S. xxx. 14), whence David naturally drew his bodyguard (see on 2 S. viii. 18). Kerethites and Pelethites are mentioned together; 'Peleth' too (see *E. Bib.*, *s.v.*, and introd. to chap. xxvi.) is certainly a N. Arabian name, and best identified with Pelešeth (Pelištim). Not impossibly both כפתרים and כרתים come from רחבתים. This is forcibly suggested by Ezek. xxv. 16, where, parallel to פלשתים and כרתים, we find שארית חוף הים, or rather ש׳ רְחוֹב יָמָן (cp. on xlix. 13); also by Zeph. ii. 5, where a similar parallelism occurs. Kaphtor, then, should probably be Reḥoboth, and Kaphtorim should be Reḥobothim; there has, in short, been redactional harmonising on a large scale. A still more worn-down form of Reḥoboth is possibly כברת (see on xxxv. 16). For כרית (1 K. xvii. 3), קריות, and קרית in place-names, another explanation is to be preferred (see on xxiii. 2).

Now as to the gloss, 'whence came out Pelishtim,' which, in the traditional text, is appended to 'Kasluḥim.' Probably this is a mistake. The scribe omitted ואת-כפתרים, and supplied it afterwards. It should, however, have preceded the notice respecting the Pelishtim (so Olsh., Budde). The Pelishtim, then, came from Kaphtor (cp. Jer. xlvii. 4); *i.e.* probably from the N. Arabian Reḥoboth. Long ago, independently of Hommel, and going further than he does,[1] I came to the conclusion that the 'Philistines' meant in the original texts of the O.T. were not the Philistines of the sea-coast, and suggested that a N. Arabian ethnic from which פלשתים might, after several corruptions, have come was צרפתים. On this I do not now lay any considerable stress. פלשתים, when it refers (as I think that it always does), not to the well-known historical Philistines of the sea-coast, but to a N. Arabian people, is due, most probably, to a confusion between 'Philistines' and 'Pelethites,' *i.e.* פלשתים should be פלתים (whence came David's Pelethites), cp. פלט (with gentilic פלטי) and פלת. At any rate, the Pelishtim (Pelethim?) were Arelites, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'elites (see on 1 S. xiv. 6, xvii. 26, 36, Ezek. xxxii. 19 *ff.*). For other views of the Philistines, see the learned articles of Moore

[1] Cp. *Grundriss*, pp. 59, 93 (note 3), 158; *Aufsätze*, p. 285, note 1. According to Hommel, they were the population of S. Palestine.

(*E. Bib.*) and Guthe (*PRE*[3]), also Noordtzij, *De Filistijnen*, 1905.

Next come the sons of Canaan (*vv.* 15-19), who are supposed to represent mostly northern populations. Thus 'Ṣidon' is taken to mean Phœnicia. Arḳite, Sinite, Arvadite, Ṣemarite, Ḥamathite are all supposed to point northward; certainly the familiar Ḥamath is north even of Phœnicia. It remains to be seen whether a more self-consistent interpretation may not be given, assuming the N. Arabian theory. Here, then, as often, let us venture to suppose that the צידון intended is a place in N. Arabia, called more fully צ׳ עֶרֶב (MT. צ׳ רַבָּה); see *Crit. Bib.* on Josh. xi. 8, xix. 28,[1] and cp. 2 S. xxiv. 6, 𝔊[A]. But, it will be asked, is it not implied in Isa. xxiii. and in Ezek. xxvii. 8 that the Ṣidon referred to was a maritime city? One may at first think so. But if Jerusalem can be figuratively represented as a ship (Isa. xxxiii. 23), why should not Ṣōr (= Miṣṣōr) be represented as a ship, and her cities (excluding Ṣidon) and allies as her builders and rowers? And as for Isa. xxiii., I think it will be found that a consistent interpretation is quite possible on the assumption that צר is a popular form of מצר (= the N. Arabian Muṣri—see on *v.* 6), that אניות תרשיש comes from ארמנות אשתר (ת׳ too will be a popular form), and that ים, as often, represents ימן, and that צידון too is a N. Arabian place (the name was carried northwards in Arabian migrations). Let us then consider this last name. The theory that there was a Phœnician god of hunting or fishing called צד[2] is a poor makeshift. It is far better, on the analogy of שם from ישמעאל, חם from ירחם, אש from אשור, etc., to take ציד in צידון and צד in the Phœnician names גרצד, צדמלקרת, etc. (see Cooke, p. 91), to represent צדק. We find this word in the

[1] In Josh. xi. 8 Ṣidon is mentioned with 'Misrephoth-maim,' *i.e.* Ṣarephath-yaman. Supplement this by 1 K. xvii. 8, where, from כרית (*i.e.* אשחרת), which fronts הירדן (*i.e.* הירחון, the stream Yarḥon, see on xv. 18), and whose inhabitants are ערבים, 'Arabians'), Elijah proceeds to 'Ṣarephath which is Ṣidon's.' In Josh. xix. 28 the (southern) territory of Asher is bordered by 'Arabian Ṣidon' (see above); cp. Judg. i. 31.

[2] See Cooke, p. 91; Ed. Meyer, *E. Bib.*, col. 4504. I think Torrey first suggested that צר is = צדק.

names Adoni-ṣedek, and many other parallels (see Zimmern, *KAT*,[3] pp. 473 *f.*). The Ṣidḳites in N. Arabia may have derived their name from a title of the god of the clan—perhaps it was a title of the god Yeraḥme'el (cp. *συδυκ* in the Phœnician cosmogony; Winckler, *KAT*, p. 224, note 1; *Crit. Bib.* pp. 410 *f.*; *E. Bib.*, col. 5374, note 1).

But why is Ṣidon called (in MT.) בְּכֹרוֹ? Is it not a sufficient honour to be named first? The problem has not been fully recognised. Evidently Gen. x. 15 must be taken with xxii. 21 and 1 Chr. ii. 42. In all these places the first problem is text-critical. The probability is that רכבו בכרו has come from רכבו, *i.e.* ירחמאל = רכבול (cp. on רכבו, Ex. xv. 1). Thus the name before us becomes Ṣidon-Yeraḥme'el.

The companion of Ṣidon is *Ḥeth* (חֵת). It has been asked whether this means the northern Hittites (1 K. x. 29, 2 K. vii. 6; cp. Judg. i. 26) or the southern (xxiii. 3 *f.*, xxvii. 46, cp. xxviii. 1, 8). According to Driver, 'Ḥeth' may be a designation of the N. Canaanitish offshoots of the great Hittite nation. It is not certain, however, that northern (Syrian) Hittites are ever referred to in the O.T. Wherever 'Ḥittites' are mentioned, the surrounding contexts favour the view that a N. Arabian people is intended; it is not possible to draw any distinction between two classes of passages. The presumption is that חת has nothing to do with Ḫeta or Ḫatti (as if we had here a reminiscence of 'Ḥittite' conquests), but is a fragment of some longer name (cp. the case of חם, שם, שור). Doubtless some very important regional or ethnic name is required, and one thinks naturally either of 'Reḥoboth' or of 'Ashḥoreth.' The latter is to be preferred. Cp. on xxiii. 3. It is a hazardous theory of Jastrow (*E. Bib.*, col. 2097) that there were two races or peoples both called 'Ḥittites,' in N.E. Syria and in S. Palestine respectively, which had nothing in common but the name. But the old view that 'Ḥittites' is used vaguely for the pre-Israelitish population of Palestine generally is not less unsatisfactory.[1] Into the questions connected with the

[1] For other views see Sayce, *Exp. Times*, March 1904, pp. 280-285; Breasted, *AJSL*, April 1905, pp. 157 *f.*; Jastrow, *E. Bib.*, 'Hittites'; Jeremias, *ATAO*, pp. 203-205.

great 'Ḥittite' empire there is no call upon one to enter here. It is to be hoped that the O.T. passages may in future be critically treated from an O.T. point of view.

Vv. 16-18 *a* are, of course, a later insertion. All the names are plainly ethnics with the article prefixed. יבוסי cannot be a mere local tribe—that inhabiting Jerusalem. It is proved that יבס, יבש, and ישב all occur as corruptions of ישמעאל (see esp. on Josh. xv. 8, Judg. xix. 10 *ff.*). That 'Yebūs' in Judg. xix. 10 is a pseudo-archaism, is a widespread error.—Between אמרי (Amorite), the Egyptian Amar,[1] and the Ass. Amurri (Amurrê) there is evidently a close connexion. The two latter designations were in early times attached to N. Palestine,[2] and only afterwards do we find the Assyrians applying *mât Amurri* to the whole of Palestine and Phœnicia, together with a part of Cœle-Syria. Scarcely, however, can we deny that the O.T. name אמרי specially belongs to a N. Arabian people, otherwise called ארמי and ירחמאלי, and the probability is that אמרי has come by a popular transposition of letters from ארמי; cp. the clan-name and place-name אמר; also the pers. name אמריהו (where יהו, as usual, comes from חו[ר]י), the Sab. יתעאמר, and the Palm. אמרשא. That Arabians in very early times spread into Palestine, Phœnicia, and Syria may be only a hypothesis, but it is absolutely required to explain a large number of facts. That אמרי means 'highlanders,' from אָמִר = אָמִיר, Isa. xvii. 9,[3] is a pure imagination.—Next, גרגשי. To be grouped with גשורי (cp. 𝔊's *γαργασει* = גשורי, Dt. iii. 14), גרזי, 1 S. xxvii. 8. Note that the הר גרזים was probably originally located in Arab-Yerahme'el (see on Dt. xi. 29), and that according to 2 S. xv. 8 there was a Geshur in Aram, *i.e.* in Yerahme'el (see *Crit. Bib.* p. 284). The original of these names was probably אשחור. More than one of the Ashhurite tribes doubtless bore a name derived from Ashhur.—חִוִּי (*v.* 17) probably = חֹרִי or חֲרִי (from אשחרי); cp. Isa. xvii. 9, where החרש = *οἱ Εὐαῖοι* (𝔊).—Then follow, it is said, five names of city-populations, all pointing to the

[1] See W. M. M. *As. u. Eur.* p. 177.

[2] In the Amarna tablets Amurru stands for the Lebanon region and N. Phœnicia. But cp. Hommel, *Gr.* p. 242.

[3] The corruptness of this passage is known from 𝔊.

far north, outside of Palestine. But the truth is that the names are primarily southern, *i.e.* N. Arabian. ערקי has probably the same origin as אכד and ארך, *v.* 10,[1] viz. אשכר. There is a Phœn. pers. name ערק (Cooke, p. 89).—סיני. That there were northern Sinites or Siyyānites (see *E. Bib.*, 'Sinite'), need not be disputed. The only question is whether a reference to southern Sinites is not most probable. The name means 'Ishmaelite' (see on Ex. xvi. 1, Ezek. xxx. 15), just as הר סיני means 'Ishmaelite mountain.' —ארודי (*v.* 18). Probably to be grouped either with עירד (iv. 18) and ירד (v. 16), or with ערער (see on Num. xxxii. 34). There is no need to think of the northern Arvad; see on Ezek. xxvii. 8 (Ṣidon and Arvad mentioned close to 'Elishah' or 'Ishmael').—צמרי. Again a southern tribe (see *E. Bib.*, 'Zemaraim'). Has the name come from מצרי?—חמתי. There may well have been several Hamaths. That there was one in the south appears from Num. xiii. 21, and probably from 2 K. xxiii. 33 (see notes). It is plausible to identify the southern Hamath with Maacah.

Next, a territorial definition, which, however, is painfully obscure (cp. *E. Bib.*, col. 4672). Apparently the first seats of the Canaanites were the Arabian Ṣidon and Reḥoboth (*v.* 15). Afterwards (*v.* 19) they extended their range,—in one direction towards Gerar (see on xx. 1), in another towards 'Sodom and Gomorrah'; 'Admah and Ṣeboim' (see on xiv. 2) seem inserted later. Two more precise statements are added—עד־עזה and עד־לשע. עזה may be a second name of some strongly fortified city such as Ṣarephath. לשע, like ליש and לשם, is a mutilated form of ישמעאל. That 'Sodom and Gomorrah' were originally located in N. Arabia appears from the true text of xiii. 10.

V. 21 introduces us to the sons of Shem (J). For the difficulties of the traditional text see Dillmann (*ad loc.*) and especially Budde (*Urgesch.* pp. 304 *ff.*). It is very strange (1) that יֻלַּד should not be followed either by בֵּן or by בָּנִים, (2) that 'Shem' should have two explanatory appositional clauses, (3) that the first of these clauses should be so circumlocutory, and (4) that the second should be so ambiguous

[1] We must remember that ערקי and ארך come from different sources.

that 𝔊, followed among moderns by Nöldeke, should take an entirely different view of the meaning from Dillmann, Budde, and the great majority of recent critics. It has not, however, been noticed that every one of the words in *v.* 21 *b*, except כל בני, is very likely, as experience has shown, to be corrupt. The combination of such words should at any rate give us pause, and if the corrections which experience suggests as possible, and which accord with our results elsewhere, should at once throw a bright light on the passage, we shall be entitled to regard them as practically certain. (1) אבי (see on iv. 20, ix. 18, xxxiii. 19) and עבר (see on עברי, xiv. 13, Num. xxiv. 24, 1 K. v. 1, 1 Chr. viii. 22) often come from עֶרֶב. (2) אחי, like אחיו (xvi. 12, etc.) and אחר (Ex. iii. 1, etc.), and as often in compound proper names, may represent אַשְׁחֻר. Cp. on xiv. 13. (3) יפת, though elsewhere from יפלט, may here represent נפתוח, whence נפתחים (see on *v.* 13). (4) גדול[ה], as in xv. 18, Dt. i. 7, etc., may come from גדעל, *i.e.* גלעד (cp. on *v.* 12). We can now explain *v.* 21. Note that אבי should be עֶרֶב; it should go with גם הוא, so forming a gloss (see on iv. 26). The verse now runs thus, וישמעאל יָלַד [גַּם הוּא] [עֶרֶב] כל־בני־עֶרֶב [אשחר ונפתוח הגלעד], 'And Ishmael begot [he, too, is Arabia] all the sons of Arabia [Ashḥur and Naphtoah of Gilead].' This is J's account expanded by two glosses. P also recognises Asshur (= Ashḥur) and Gilead (under the form 'Lud') as sons of Shem, agreeing in this with the glossator. J has mentioned Naptuḥim among the sons of Miṣrim (*v.* 13). It has been observed by others that 'Aram' is not mentioned. True, but Yoḳṭan is mentioned in *v.* 25 (see below).

We now expect to hear about the 'sons of Arâb'; nor are we disappointed. *V.* 25 gives the names of the two sons of עבר, or rather ערב (see on *v.* 21), viz. *Peleg* and *Yoḳṭan.* פלג surely has no connexion with the region 'el-aflag' in Central Arabia (Hommel), nor with the canals (פלגי מים) of the energetic Babylonian king Ḫammurabi (Sayce). It may be a shortened form of a compound, פ representing פד in פדן (see on xxv. 20), and לג the גל in גלעד and the גיל in אביגיל (cp. on xxxi. 47). The explanation which follows may be a late gloss. יקטן has been explained already (see

on ix. 24, p. 152) as coming from אשקן = אשקל, *i.e.* אשר ירח'. Cp. on 'Yokshan,' xxv. 2.

Yoḳṭan's sons follow. Observe that *Havilah* and *Sheba* here appear among the Yoḳṭanites, *i.e.* as Shemites, whereas in *v.* 7 Havilah is a son of Kush, and Sheba a son of Raamah and a grandson of Kush, *i.e.* both are Ḥamites. But the distinction between Shem and Ḥam is purely artificial. Now, as to *Almodad.* Most regard this as the name of a S. Arabian tribe, and the only question is, whether אל in אלמודד is the Arabic article (so still Kön. *Lehrgeb.* ii. 417) or אֵל, 'God.' Glaser (*Skizze*, ii. 280) remarks, 'Evidently compounded of El or Il (God) and *maudad*, *mawâdid*, *muwaddad*, which occurs sometimes in the inscriptions.' Thus we get 'God is beloved,' a meaning as improbable as 'God pities' for 'Yeraḥme'el.' But, remembering such a name as Abimael (*v.* 28), *i.e.* Arab-Yeraḥme'el, it is much more probable that we should group the letters a very little differently, and read מאל-דוד, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el of Dôd. 'Dôd' (see pp. 46-49) is the name both of a region and of a god. As to *Sheleph* (שֶׁלֶף). If '*Hazarmaveth*' were really = Ḥaḍramaut, 'Sheleph' might be one of the many places in S. Arabia called *Salf* (Glaser, ii. 425). Most probably, however, שלף, like צלף (Neh. iii. 30), represents ישמעאל. The intermediate form is שבל (cp. שובל). Cp. on זלפה, xxix. 24.—As to the form חצרמות, there is no doubt that it occurs in Sabæan inscriptions; and most critics confidently trace the Hebrew name to S. Arabia, and identify it with mod. *Hadramaut*, on which see Bent, *South Arabia* (1900) p. 71. We must not, however, infer that when some name in the Hebrew records is identical with a Sabæan name, it has, therefore, the same local reference. Nothing is more common or more perplexing than the reappearance of names in widely separated localities. We have first of all to ascertain where the scene of the narrative is laid, or to what region a list of names belongs. On this point of method many critics are too careless. Hence, regardless of inconsistencies, they identify עילם with 'Elymais,' פלג with Phalga in the Euphrates region, and now חצרמות with a district a little to the east of Aden. But surely textual criticism has its rights. A wide survey of the texts

will show that חצר may represent [א]שחר, and that מות may be a corruption either of תמול = ישמעאל or of ירימות = ירחמאל (as in Isa. xxv. 8, xxviii. 15, and perhaps Ps. xviii. 5).[1]

We now approach a result which is consistent with our view of all the rest of this composite Table. חצרמות represents אשחר ירחמאל, *i.e.* some part of the region in the N. Arabian border-land called Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el. Probably the name suffered at an early date from popular and scribal corruption. Cp. on the one hand חצר שועל (Josh. xv. 28), *i.e.* אשחר ישמ', and on the other עזמות (2 S. xxiii. 31, Neh. vii. 28), where עז probably comes from עזל, a worn-down and corrupt form of ישמעאל (see on 'Uzal,' *v.* 27).—ירח is a shorter form of ירחם = ירחמאל (see pp. 27 *f.*). The writer seems to have put down all the names he could; their origin has long since been forgotten. Not impossibly ירח in the Phœn. name עבד ירח (*TSBA* v. 456) has the same origin, which, presumably, at an early date passed out of remembrance.[2]

Hadoram (הדורם; cp. Sab. הדרום) is also the name of a son of a king of Hamath (1 Chr. xviii. 10; 2 S. viii. 10?). Its meaning is not religious ('beloved of the High One,' Baethgen), but geographical. רם, as in אברם, etc., is = ארם (ירחמ'); הד, like חדד (xxv. 15), is a tribal name. Cp. on הדד, xxxvi. 35.—אוזל; Sam. איזל, 𝔊 *αιζηλ*. From ישמעאל. So יזל (𝔊 presupposes יאזל), Num. xxiv. 7; עזאזל, Lev. xvi. 8.—דקלה. Probably from חדקלה (see on חדקל, ii. 14). 'Palm-land' is out of the question.—עובל. Here, as elsewhere, we are on Yeraḥme'elite ground. Sam. עיבל, a name found in Dt. xi. 29, and probably = ישמעאל. Cp. אובל, Dan. viii. 2.—*Abimael* (אבימאל) may be traced to [ירח]מאל עֲרַב. 'Father is God' is untenable.[3]—*Sheba*, see

[1] Cheyne, *Psalms*(2), p. lxxvi.

[2] עבד in such names may be an early corruption of ערב, 'Arabia.' Cp. on 'Eber,' *v.* 21; 'Hebrew,' xiv. 13.

[3] 'Father is God' implies that מ is a trace of the ancient 'mimation'; cp. the early Bab. name Abum-ilu, and the Sab. אבמעתר (as if = 'Father is Attar,' Hal. 148, 4). But אבי so often represents עֲרַב, and מאל, like מלא, is so often a mutilation of ירחמאל, that the theory referred to is not only in itself improbable but superfluous. Such a name as that Sabæan one has probably been conventionalised. The underlying name will have had a quite different, non-religious meaning. Often the ancient men may have had two forms of names.

on *v.* 7.—*Ophir* (אופיר) still awaits explanation (cp. *E. Bib.*, *s.v.*).—*Havilah*, see on *v.* 7.—*Yobab* (יובב). An Edomite (or Arammite?) name, xxxvi. 33; Canaanite, Josh. xi. 1; Ashḥurite and Benjamite, 1 Chr. viii. 9; Benjamite, 1 Chr. viii. 18. Later on, it was identified by the Greeks with Job (*Iyyōb*), Job xlii. 18. Among 𝔊's readings are *ιωαβ* and *ιωβαδ*, and note that *ιωαβ* is also among 𝔊's readings for חבב. In fact, יובב, יואב, and חבב should be grouped together. All three not improbably come from ירחו־ערב, where ירחו (whence יחו and יהו) is = ירחמאל. בב represents עביב (= עֲרָב); cp. תל אביב, for תל עביב = Tubal-ʿarâb. A radical duplicated as in שש = ישמ׳, etc. Jeremias (*ATAO*, p. 170) finds the prophet Hosea's ירב underneath יובב. But ירב, as I have elsewhere shown, must be עֲרָב. Glaser, however (*Skizze*, ii. 303), connects יובב with the Sab. tribal name *Yuhaibab*. Cp. on xxxvi. 33 *f.*—In *v.* 30 the extent of the Yoḳtanite country is described.—*Mesha* (משא) comes from ישמעאל; cp. on 'Mash,' *v.* 23, and on 'Massa,' xxv. 14. —סְפָר, possibly from [ת]צרפ; cp. on קרית ספר, Josh. xv. 15, and on ספרד, Obad. 20. There may well have been more than one Ṣarephath in the Arabian border-land.—הר הקדם. Meyer (p. 244), 'the desert mountainous region eastward of Edom.' F. Brown, however, thinks that the phrase 'the mountain of the East' is 'too general an expression to give precision to the undefined geographical terms of this verse' (*E. Bib.*, 'Sephar'). In fact, the commentators differ as to the reference; Delitzsch and Driver think of the incense-mountains between Ḥaḍramaut and Mahra. The truth most probably is (see *E. Bib.*, 'Rekem,' and on xxv. 6, 13, xxix. 1, 1 K. v. 10), that Ḳedem (קדם) in a whole group of names (Ḳadmoni, Ḳedemah, Ḳedemoth, bene Ḳedem) comes from Reḳem (רקם). This modification may have been effected very early, and may perhaps have been known in Egypt as early as the twelfth dynasty. Read הר רקם (or הררי), and for the phrase see on Num. xxiii. 7.

THE INTERRUPTED BUILDING (GEN. XI. 1-9)

IT would not be strange in any folklore to find a myth accounting for the dispersion of mankind and the variety of languages as due to a divine curse. And if in some country there happened to be some ancient and lofty tower which had been shattered by a storm, we might expect to find traces of a myth ascribing the erection of it to the first human folk, and its shattered condition to the wrath of the gods at the attempt of men to draw near to their own lofty dwelling-place. Moreover, these two myths—that of the curse producing the many languages and that of the divinely injured tower—might conceivably be combined. The question therefore arises: Did this combination take place in Israelitish folklore, so far as can be seen from the scanty fragments of it preserved in Genesis?

An affirmative answer has sometimes been given. It has been supposed that some of the Semitic peoples may have ascribed the curse of many tongues to the bold attempt of early men, not indeed to ascend into heaven (though, besides the Babylonians, the Polynesians, and N. American Indians could offer many parallels for such a tradition), but to produce such a monument of their strength that humanity might have something to boast of even before the gods. As in the case of other myths, the original site of this tower may have been in Wonderland. But when, through a devastating storm, a temple-tower (*ziggurrat*) in or near Babylon had fallen into disrepair, 'wandering Aramæan tribes may have marked it, and connecting it with the "babel" of foreign tongues in Babylon, may have localised the myth at the ruined temple-tower. *Balbel*, they would have exclaimed: it was here that God confounded men's

speech, and the proofs of it are the ruined tower and the name of Babel.'[1]

The theory here described has the merit of plausibility. The ruined tower spoken of might be the *ziggurrat* of Borsippa, of which Nebuchadnezzar tells us that it had 'fallen into decay since remote days,' though others have thought of the *ziggurrat* of the great temple Ē-sagila in Babylon itself, which was known to Greek writers as the temple of Belos, and of which the same king tells us that he restored and finished it.[2]

Further consideration, however, will show that though there are some points in its favour, it labours under great difficulties. In its favour are the reference to building with bricks and bitumen (*v.* 3), the mention of a tower 'whose top is in heaven' (a phrase which *might* be borrowed from some Babylonian myth or myths), and the name בבל (Babel); but until textual criticism has had its say we cannot venture to assert that these notable points are really decisive. And against the theory are these three notable points, which are independent of textual criticism:—1. The unique position of Babylon, and the vast indebtedness of the surrounding peoples to this focus of culture, which make it inconceivable that, to any of them, the name of Babylon should have suggested the thought of a curse. The Babylonians themselves explained the name of this chief city as meaning 'the gate of God' (or 'of the gods'). If the Hebrew story of the tower of Babel has a Babylonian connexion, we may certainly wonder that the idea conveyed in the phrase 'gate of God' (cp. xxviii. 17) does not find expression. 2. A Babylonian *ziggurrat* possessed extreme sanctity. With its seven stages or terraces it symbolised the heavenly zodiac, which was imagined to consist of seven parallel zones, one upon another,[3] or, more simply, the heavenly mountain on whose summit the gods dwelt.[4] If the tower referred to in

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Babel, Tower of,' § 4.

[2] *Ibid.* § 7, where add reference to Hommel, *Gr.* pp. 314 *ff.*

[3] See Winckler, *GI* ii. 108 *f.*, note 6; Zimmern, *KAT*, pp. 615 *f.*; Jeremias, *ATAO*, pp. 11 *f.*; Hommel, *Gr.* p. 363, note 4, cp. p. 126.

[4] The seat of Anu (the divine Father) is to the north of the zodiac, in fact the north pole of the heaven; see Jensen, *Kosmol.* pp. 16 *ff.*;

v. 4 was such, the object of its builders must have been, not to 'make themselves a name,' but to please the gods. To wish to approach the *elohim* was no impiety, but seemly in the highest degree for devout worshippers. If the early Babylonian king Gudea can speak of the ascending of the temple of the seven *tubuḳati* or stages (?) as a work well-pleasing to God, surely the act of these builders must have been so too. And how could it be said that God came down to see the tower, which, if a *ziggurrat*, was manifestly a copy of the tower-like zodiac from which he himself had come? That the Aramæan tribes would not have known this, is a mere assumption. The influence of Babylonian culture was far-reaching, and Aramæan tribes cannot have been exempt from its operation. 3. The last, not least, of these unfavourable points is the want of an adequate philological basis (see p. 185) for the current identification of the 'land of Shinar' with Babylonia.

The question of the origin of the Hebrew story is complicated by the existence of phenomena which point to a *dual authorship*, viz. (*a*) the want of connectedness in *v.* 4; (*b*) the mention of Yahweh's 'going down' (*v.* 5) before the council of the elohim at which it was proposed that the elohim, led by Yahweh, should 'go down'; (*c*) the reference to the 'confusion' of the 'language' without any mention of the 'dispersion' of the builders in *v.* 7; (*d*) the mention of the city in *v.* 8 without the tower.

The problem thus produced was solved in his own way by the author of the Book of Jubilees (x. 19-26), who virtually places *v.* 5 after *vv.* 6 and 7. He also inserts 'and the tower' in *v.* 8*b*, and gives a special account of the destruction of the tower, which became necessary because (like the author of the gloss in 𝔊's version of Isa. x. 9) he did not localise the tower within the city of Babel.

The boldest and at first sight most thorough modern

Jeremias, *ATAO*, p. 27. A Hebrew poet has been thought to give a similar representation. 'I will sit upon the *har mōʿēd* in the recesses of the north' is supposed to be parallel to 'I will ascend into heaven,' etc., 'and I will ascend above the heights of the clouds' (Isa. xiv. 13 *f.*). This view, however, needs rectification. See p. 85.

solution is that of Gunkel.[1] He distributes *vv.* 1-9 among two narrators, one of whom speaks of a tower, and represents Yahweh as going down at once to see the tower, and the other speaks of a city, and represents Yahweh as proposing to his councillors that they should go down and take action together against mankind. And yet even this is not altogether satisfactory. The idea of dual authorship I accept; but the facts, as I view them, compel me to give it a somewhat different form. The original story, I should say, referred not only to the tower but to the city. It did not specially mention the fate of the city (of which the tower is a necessary appendage), only because this event is sufficiently indicated by the mention of the cessation of the building. Possibly the original story may have referred to a mighty wind as frightening the builders and overturning their work, but this supposition is not absolutely necessary. Most probably the story did not give the name of Babel to the city, though it is true that later scribes (cp. on x. 10) knew of a Yamanite city so designated. It contained no reference to bricks and bitumen, nor to the height of the tower, nor to the confusion of the speech of the builders. The text appears to have soon become corrupted, and in this state to have reached the second writer, who was also perhaps the redactor. To those who have had experience in detecting recurrent types of corruption, plausible corrections will not fail to occur. My own will be offered presently. It may be helpful, first of all, to exhibit the effect of my corrections on the narrative.

'Now the whole population of the land (earth?) was one family. And it happened that when they journeyed from Reḳem, they found a wide valley in the land of Shinar [Arab-Ashḥur], and they dwelt there. And they said, Come, let us build us a city and a tower [in Asshur-Ishmael], and let us win for ourselves deliverance there, lest we become dispersed thoughout the land (earth?). And Yahweh said, Behold, they are one people—one family [Yeraḥme'el]—and this is the beginning of their doings; henceforth nothing

[1] Cp. Stade's suggestions, 'Der Thurm zu Babel,' in *Akad. Reden* (1899), p. 275; his view that the legend came directly in a literary form from Babylonia seems very unplausible.

will be beyond their reach which they may plan to do. Come, let us go down, and there strike them with sudden terror (?), that they may give up building the city. And Yahweh dispersed them from thence throughout all the land (earth?). Therefore men call its name Bilhah (?), for there Yahweh struck with sudden terror the whole population of the land (earth?), and from thence Yahweh dispersed them throughout all the land (earth?)'

To understand the above it should be remembered that xi. 1-9 belongs to a stratum of narrative which (as others have shown) has no deluge-story, and in which Noaḥ (Naḥam) is the first vine-dresser, and his sons, Shem, Ḥam, and Yepheth, are the ancestors of the people of N. Arabia. When the first men left Paradise, they appear still to have kept in its vicinity, *i.e.* in that part of Yeraḥme'el (or Asshur-Yeraḥme'el) which was specially called Reḳem. The notion of the story of xi. 1-9 most probably was that, needing a change of pastures, the first men sought out a wide valley, or plain, in another part of the large region afterwards called Yeraḥme'elite, where for some time these nomads stayed. But they could not forget the sad details of their expulsion from Eden. Who could tell that superhuman beings might not once more appear, and scatter them all over the land? Their sense of the family-tie was also necessarily very strong, for the beginning of human society was not far off, and men's wives had often to be their sisters. So, for mutual support, and to guard against those visitors who, if human in form, were more than human in power, the first human folk devised the plan of living in houses defended by city walls and a tower. Could this idea be realised, it would, as they hoped, be a 'winning of deliverance.' But they were reckoning without the host. Far away on the sacred mountain the divine beings saw the builders, and suspected danger to their supremacy from a strong and united human folk. Therefore their leader and director proposed that they should 'go down' and strike the men with a sudden and unreasonable terror. The men would then flee in wild confusion in different directions, and the city would never be finished. Hence the name 'Bilhah' (as if Ballāhāh, 'sudden terror'), if this, or something like this, was the

name of the city and its tower. That the name is not impossible, we know from 1 Chr. iv. 29, and in xxxvi. 27 we meet with the Ḥorite (*i.e.* Ashḥurite) clan-name Bilhan. Further, in Job xviii. 14 we find it said of the wicked rich man that he will have to go למלך בלהות, or rather ל׳ ירחמאל, 'to king Yeraḥme'el,' the god Yeraḥme'el having become regarded as the king of the underworld.[1] This does not exclude the admission that this important place may have had other popular names, such as בלע (from ירחמאל, like בליעל in 1 S. x. 27, Nah. ii. 1), and even בבל (see on x. 10). I only mention בלהה as a very possible name, and the one which best suits the legend. Supposing בלע (Bela; cp. xiv. 2) were the name originally used, we might suppose that the earliest legend spoke of the destruction of the city by fire from heaven (cp. Sodom), since the verb בלע may perfectly well mean to lay waste in general (cp. 2 S. xx. 19 *f.*, || השחית).

It is only fair to add that we are not absolutely bound to suppose that the original narrator had in his mind any inhabited place in N. Arabia. A hint may here be taken from Jubilees (x. 26), where it is said that 'the Lord sent a mighty wind against the tower, and overthrew it upon the earth, . . . and they called its name Overthrow' (הפכה). There is a class of ruined places in Arabia (called *maḳlûbât*, 'overturned') which, according to legend, were destroyed by a divine judgment—such places, according to Delitzsch, are referred to in a famous poetical indictment of the wicked man in Job xv. 28.[2]

That the passage before us has had textual vicissitudes, should be obvious. Indeed, it must already have been corrupt when the early redactor received it. This person appears to have corrected it under the influence of a preconceived idea that no other city but Babylon could have been represented in tradition as the city of 'all the earth.' Though it could not be realised at once, the dream of a world-metropolis was, he may have thought, realised after-

[1] Cp. Job xxx. 23, where כל חי may have come from בלהות, a corruption (see above) of ירח׳; also בעל זבוב, the name of an arch-demon in later times, which comes from בעל ישמעאל. See p. 54.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, col. 4670.

wards. And the 'babel' of languages to be heard in the streets of the later city may have confirmed this writer in his interpretation. Hence a plausible derivation occurred to him for the name Babel. And with much skill he introduced a second speech of the builders, with true Babylonian colouring (*v.* 3, bricks and bitumen). He also inserted a statement on the descent of Yahweh (*v.* 5), which may have seemed to correct the religiously questionable phrase, 'Let us go down' (*v.* 7).

Let us now pass on to the text-critical details. Surely the construction in *v.* 1, for which I can find no complete parallel, is very bold, and all the more improbable in view of לְכֻלָּם in *v.* 6 (at least if that word is correct). An equally bold phrase follows—דברים אחדים. 𝔊 seeks to remove the boldness by supplying לכלם (*φωνὴ μία πᾶσιν*), but דברים is not *φωνή*, and the difficulty of *χεῖλος ἕν* remains. It is now usual to render 'einerlei Redensarten.' But how can אחדים mean 'einerlei,' 'the same,' in view of xxvii. 44, xxix. 20, Dan. xi. 20? Early rabbis were conscious of the difficulty. Some, *e.g.*, virtually read ד׳ חִדִּים, 'sharp words (against God)'; see *Ber. rabba*, Par. xxxviii. Clearly there is a call for textual criticism. שפה cannot be right; let us take a hint from *v.* 6, where עם and שפה (or some word underlying it) are parallel, and read משפחה; מ and ח became illegible, and so שפה remained. אחדים, if incorrect, may with much probability be corrected into אשחֻרים; אחד or אחר has often come from אשחֻר (*e.g.* Isa. xxvii. 12). דברים may represent ערבים (cp. on xv. 1); ד or ר and ע can be confounded; cp. MT. and 𝔊 of Dt. xi. 22, xix. 9, xxviii. 58, xxxi. 12 (שמר and שמע). Probably, however, we should disregard the plural endings and read ערב־אשחר, 'Arab-Ashḥur,' which is presumably a gloss on ארץ שנער (*v.* 2).

In *v.* 2 the commentators usually render מקדם, 'eastward'; Kautzsch-Socin prefer 'in the east.' Neither rendering is natural in a passage where geographical distinctness is of importance. We are told where the point was that the first men reached, and we expect to be told where they started from. As Stade has noticed (*ZATW*, 1894, p. 276), it was from the region of Eden that they started on their journey; 𝔊 is therefore correct in rendering *ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν*.

At the same time, Dillmann's remark that קדם by itself does not mean 'eastern land' is weighty as against Stade. Only, Dillmann ought to have been led to examine critically into the reading קדם. For it is contrary to all sound exegesis to explain בְּנֵי קֶדֶם (Judg. vi. 3, etc.) as a collective term for the eastern Arabs (Dillm., p. 315). The evidence suggests that קדם has been persistently produced by a redactor or redactors out of רקם (see *E. Bib.*, 'Ṛekem,' 'Sela'). The true reading, therefore, is מֵרקם. Cp. on xiii. 11. The early nomads came to a halt in the land of שנער, *i.e.* Ishmael-Arabia (for a gloss see above on *v.* 1), exactly where the rule of Nimrod (Raḥman?) had its beginning, and there they built a city with a tower. The text (which is supported by 𝔊) states that the tower which they planned was to be so lofty that it would seem to touch the sky, a common hyperbole in Assyrian and Babylonian as well as Egyptian descriptions (see *E. Bib.*, col. 411, note 3). But is וראשו בשמים at all a likely reading? A rhetorical hyperbole of this kind is out of character with the simple builders (Dt. i. 28 is quite a different case), and if it is not a hyperbole, but meant in sober earnest, it is a boast like that of Isa. xiv. 13, and much more would have been made of it. At the very least, the destruction of the impiously meant tower would have been mentioned, and not merely the breaking-off of the building of the city. Is there no balm for this grievous wound? Certainly. ראש often (*e.g.* Ezek. xxxviii. 2 *f.*), and in 2 S. xiv. 26 ראשו, represent אֲשֶׁר, and שמים often (*e.g.* xlix. 25) has come from ישמעאל. Read most probably באַשֶּׁר ישמעאל, which seems to be a gloss on עיר ומגדל, stating where city and tower were situated. Asshur-Ishmael was both a region (see on ix. 20, 28, x. 1) and a city (see on Dt. i. 4).

Not less improbable, as is shown by the variations of the commentators, is ונעשה שם. The MT. not being infallible, let us try the effect of a criticism based on parallel instances. In Isa. xxxviii. 15, xliv. 23, lxiv. 3, Ps. xxii. 32, xxxvii. 5, lii. 11, one or another verbal form of עשה has displaced a verbal form of השיע. Beyond doubt this has also been the case here. Read וְנִשִּׁיעָה לָנוּ שָׁם.

V. 6 has to be taken with *v.* 1; read ומשפחה אחת

[ירחמאל]. לכלם has arisen quite naturally (cp. מלך often, and כלמד, Ezek. xxvii. 23, from ירחמ'); so in 2 K. xix. 35. The duplication of a letter (here ל) is common in corruptions.—'Let us confound their speech,' etc., in *v.* 7, betrays the hand of the second writer or redactor. The easiest form of restoration is to read, for ונבלה וגו', simply וּנְבַלְהֵם (cp. Ps. ii. 5), and complete the speech by bringing over the three last words of *v.* 8. To read נבלעה (with בלע for the name of the city) would involve supposing that the redactor dealt more violently with the original text. *V.* 8 *a* will then be quite in order. In *v.* 9 for בבל we may perhaps read בלהה, Bilhah, or Ballāhah (see introd.), and restore the rest of the verse in accordance with the translation given above. Let us remember, however, that the later scribes recognised a second city called בבל (see on x. 10).

SHEMITE GENEALOGY (GEN. XI. 10-26)

THE scheme of this Shemite genealogy resembles that of the early genealogy (also P's) in chap. v. Shem, Arpakshad, Shelaḥ, 'Eber, and Peleg we know already. The first-named is said to have begotten Arpakshad 'two years after the *mabbūl*'; *mabbūl* is said to mean 'deluge.' The difficulties of this statement are fully set forth by Dillmann, Budde, and Holzinger. No satisfactory way of surmounting them has yet been devised, so that Budde has been compelled to suppose that שנתים אחר המבול is a gloss by some one who aimed at a strict chronology, but left ix. 28 *f.* out of consideration. Very arbitrary, but it seemed the last resource. And yet one more remedy remains to be tried, viz. textual criticism, of the kind which has already

served us well in similar cases. Acting on this plan we have already restored the reading which underlies אחר המבול in ix. 28, x. 1, 32, viz. אשחֻר ירחמאל. Next, שנתים has to be studied. 'Two years' is not at all what we expect. Clearly we require a place-name, and we may presume that the true text had a compound name equivalent to, and suitable as a gloss on, Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el. Can we be in doubt any longer? I hope no reader will deny that a popular form of Ashtar (= Asshur and Ashḥur) is שת (see on iv. 25), and that a similar shortened popular form of ירחמ׳ or ישמ׳ is ימן. Next, it is not too much to expect that a scribe will have transposed one or two letters. Thus we get, for שנתים, שת ימן (= Ashtar-Yaman), a gloss on אש׳ ירחמ׳. The preposition בְּ has dropped out. A parallel to this corruption exists in Am. i. 1, where the closing words should be read [על] שת־ימן לפני אשחר, 'against Sheth-Yaman, eastward of Ashḥur.' The result in xi. 10 is that when 'Arpakshad' was born, his father (according to P) was still living where Noaḥ had lived (ix. 20, 28)—in Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el — the favourite land of primitive legendary tradition.

The next names are (*a*) רעו, which is not a Mesopotamian divine name (so Mez), but to be explained like רעואל and ראובן, *i.e.* is a relic of ירחמאל (cp. on xxix. 32); (*b*) שרוג, which is not the Mesopotamian district Sarug, but, by transposition, from גשור (= אחשור), primarily a N. Arabian name; (*c*) נחור, which may indeed be connected with the name of a (N.) Aramæan deity (Jensen), but is primarily an Arabian district-name[1] (see on xxiv. 10); (*d*) תרח, which is not from Ass. *turaḫu*, 'wild goat' (Del., Jensen), nor an intentional distortion of ירח, 'moon' (Winckl.), but, like קטורה, תרתק, and חרת (1 S. xxii. 5), probably comes from אשחרת; cp. on xxv. 1 (Keṭurah); (*e*) אברם, *i.e.* עֲרַב אֲרָם,—אב and אבי often represent עבר, *i.e.* עֲרָב; see, further, on xvii. 5; (*f*) הרן, not 'mountaineer,' but differentiated from חרן (Wellh.), the name of the place where the Teraḥites halted in their migration, and which, as we shall see

[1] Note that Naḥor is both the father and the son of Teraḥ. Evidently an important name. Hence, xxxi. 53, 'the God of Naḥor.'

presently, is an Asshurite name. That 'Haran' is the god of the early light, and identical with Ninib-Tamûz (Winckler, *GI* ii. 97), is a theory which cannot stand by itself, and must share the fate of the mythological theory of Abram and Sarai.

GENEALOGY OF TERAḤ (GEN. XI. 27-32)

To the statement already made in *v.* 26 it is now added that Haran begat Loṭ (לוט). This was originally the name of a Ḥorite tribe; cp. Loṭan, Gen. xxxvi. 20, 29. To understand this we must assume results arrived at elsewhere, viz. that Seir and Ḥori are independent derivatives of Asshur or Ashḥur; and we shall see presently that Ḥaran (whence Haran) is also an Ashḥurite name. In fact, Seir (= Ḥor) was a part of that wide land of Ashḥur, different parts of which were occupied by Esau, Jacob, and Laban respectively (see on xxxii. 4-20). And now as to the name Loṭ. Plausible as Winckler's explanation, 'one who is taken into the family,'[1] may be—he thinks that a pre-Edomitish tribe was admitted into union with the Edomites,—it is too much out of accord with the general theory of names to be accepted. We want some N. Arabian district-name; it should presumably be of more than one syllable, and one of the syllables must be either לוט, or at least capable of being corrupted into לוט. The name required is probably גלעד. This word has become גלית in 1 S. xvii. 4, and גלות in Am. i. 6, Ob. 20. לות from גלות is like חור from אשחור; ת and ט are often con-

[1] *AOF* ii. 87 *f.*, referring to Ar. *laṭa* in viii.

founded (cp. טבאל from אתבעל). It should also be noted that in the place-name לא דבר or לו ד'[1] (2 S. xvii. 27; ix. 4) לאד or לוד probably represents גלעד. The southern or Arabian Gilead cannot have been very far from Ḥaran (the name is the original of Loṭ's father's name), as will be shown on chap. xxxi.; by Ḥaran I mean here the southern Ḥaran, which was in the land of 'the benê Reḳem' (so read xxix. 1), *i.e.* some part of the region called Asshur-Yeraḥme'el.

Loṭ (*i.e.* 'Gilead'?) was the son of Haran, and Haran is not really different from Ḥaran. What, then, is the origin of the latter name? Analogy suggests that חרן comes from אחרן, *i.e.* אשחרן (cp. on Dt. xi. 24). It is therefore an Ashḥurite name; similarly in 1 Chr. ii. 46 Ḥaran appears as Yeraḥme'elite, and in 1 Chr. xxiii. 9 Haran as a son of Shimei (= Ishmaelite). According to most, Ḥaran is once called 'the city of Naḥor.' Most probably, however (see on xxiv. 10), we should read, not 'to the city of Naḥor,' but 'to Arab-naḥor.' The historical conjectures of Winckler (cp. *Bible Problems*, pp. 150-153) depend upon the view that the Ḥaran of Genesis is the Ḫarran of the cuneiform inscriptions, which was for many centuries a centre of moon-worship. These conjectures have at last found acceptance with a 'Saul among the prophets.' According to Prof. B. Baentsch, best known as an able commentator of the predominant critical school, the mere mention of the names of such sanctuaries as Ur-Kasdim, Ḫarran, and On (Heliopolis), could not but suggest to any cultivated Oriental of antiquity a complete world of higher religious ideas.[2] From this he infers that if Abram and Joseph were brought by tradition into connexion with these sanctuaries, it was because there was still a consciousness that the 'fathers' (Ex. iii. 15) represented by Abram and Joseph were both acquainted with and influenced by the ideas of the priesthoods of those famous places. A fatal concession, due in the first instance to the prevalent excessive textual conservatism. I fear I must add that the failure to recognise, as at any rate highly probable, the existence of a southern Haran or Ḥaran has led Winckler equally with less ortho-

[1] The whole name comes from גלעד עֵדֶ.

[2] *Altorient. u. altisraelit. Monotheismus* (1906), p. 50.

dox critics into faulty constructions both in early and in later history.[1]

We may now inquire, From what district or region did Teraḥ and his family migrate? We are told (*v.* 28) that 'Haran died before his father Teraḥ (*coram eo*) in his native land, in Ur-Kasdim,' also (*v.* 31) that Teraḥ 'took his son Abram . . . and brought them[2] (Sam., 𝔊, Vg.) from Ur-Kasdim to go into the land of Canaan,' and that they 'came as far as Ḥaran, and dwelt there,' and (*v.* 32) that 'Teraḥ died in Ḥaran.' Teraḥ, then, dwelt in Ur-Kasdim (?), in which district (?) we may conjecture that there was a place which bore the often mutilated name, Ashḥoreth, because Teraḥ most probably records the name of a place where his reputed descendants abode, and this not improbably was Ashḥoreth (see on 'Kiryath-arba,' xxiii. 2).

I am aware that there is a critical dogma which is opposed to this view. It is very commonly supposed[3] that 'Ur-Kasdim' means, not a district, but a city, and no less a city than the old Babylonian Uru, famous religiously by its devotion to the moon-god, and raised by its fortunate situation to a leading place among commercial cities.[4] I have no doubt that priceless archæological and literary treasures will reward a thorough excavation of the mounds. I cannot, however, retract what I have said elsewhere (*Bible Problems*, p. 153): 'As yet no proof at all has been offered for the assumption that Ur-Kasdim is represented by the ruins of el-Muḳayyar, six miles south of the Euphrates. Those ruins do undoubtedly represent the ancient Uru, but between Ur-Kasdim and Uru a great gulf is fixed.' The difficulties in the prevalent view have been stated in the article, 'Ur of the Chaldees' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* (1903), to which, for economy of space, I now refer. There, too, a new solution of the problem of Ur-Kasdim was put forward. The word כשדים (not less than אור) having met with no satis-

[1] The familiar but incorrect 'Sanballaṭ the Ḥoronite' most probably represents 'Shementubal the Ḥaranite' (Shemen = Ishmael).

[2] Unless we should read ויצאו מאתמעל, 'and they went out from Ethmael,' taking אתם to be for 'מאת (מאתמעל). Ethbaal or Ethmael = Ishmael.

[3] See, however, Kittel (*Hist.* i. 18; but cp. note 4) and Gunkel (*Genesis*[1], p. 145; but cp. *Gen.*[2] p. 139).

[4] See Rogers, *HBA* ii. 371 *f.*, quoted in *E. Bib.*, col. 5232.

factory explanation,[1] an appeal was made to textual criticism. We have seen (note on כוש, x. 6) that כש and שכ, as well as חש, as elements of names, are fragments of אשחֶר; cp. משך, שכם, דמשק, etc., while דים may be expected to represent אדום, as רם represents ארם, so that כשדים may conceivably have come from אשחֶר אדום. The parallel of דמשק, however, suggests a different theory. The place or district so called is (at any rate in most passages) in Aram, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el. The question therefore arises whether כשדים, like דמשק (or rather—see on xv. 2—רמשק), may not originally have signified Ashḥur-Yaman, and the answer must be in the affirmative. Cp. Isa. iii. 3, reading חכם חשרם,[2] and 1 Chr. iv. 14, Neh. xi. 35, reading גיא חשרם.

As to אור, it is clear that, like עיר (*e.g.* in x. 11, Judg. i. 16, 1 S. xv. 5, Ezek. xvii. 4), it may very well represent ערב;[3] possibly, indeed, an earlier reading (cp. 𝔊, ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ = באר') was אר (from ער'). In x. 22 we have already met with ערב-כשרם under the thin disguise of ארפכשד; it is but a short step further to recognise the same phrase under the impossible reading אור כשדים. The view to which this leads is that, according to the original tradition, Abram (the Yeraḥme'elite patriarch) first dwelt in Arab-Kaśram (cp. on xv. 7), and thence journeyed to Ḥaran in the (southern) land of Canaan. Geographically, it may be well to remark that Kaśram (trad. text, כשדים) cannot have been far from Asshur on the one hand and Canaan on the other, for in Ezek. xvi. 28 *f.* it is mentioned as in proximity to both ('unto the land of Canaan, unto Kaśram'); also that 'Asshur' can be used in a large sense, so as to include the southern Canaan (see on xxxiii. 18). The passage has been greatly misunderstood, and a precise geographical explanation is still in the distance.

[1] The latest Assyriological explanation is perhaps that of Hommel (*Gr.* p. 187, note 4), 'the old Kašdi, the inhabitants of Gù-Edin = Kišad-Edini, the district about Ur and Eridu.' He regards Ur-Kasdîm, Késed, and Arpa-Kesad ('Chaldæans' boundary' = MT.'s Arpakšad) as synonyms for Chaldæa. But how does *arpa* mean 'boundary,' and what has become of *edini*?

[2] N. Arabia was famed for its 'wisdom.' See pp. 40 *f.*

[3] So probably אר in the Phœnician name ארמלך (Cooke, p. 18) = Urumilki on the Taylor cylinder of Sennacherib.

The names of the wives still remain (*v.* 29). Abram's wife is called שרי, which may correspond to the name Sa-ra-a (Sarai?) which is borne by a Mesopotamian woman on a Babylonian tablet (K 1274) of the Sargonide period, translated by Johnston, *Ass. Epist. Lit.*, Baltimore, 1898, p. 174. ־י may be an archaic Arabising feminine ending.[1] The root letters may represent the שר in אֶשֶׁר. See on xvii. 15 (Sarah), xxxii. 29 (Israel). For the views of Jensen and Winckler see *E. Bib.*, 'Sarah,' § 2; for those of Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, pp. 568 *f.* Nahor's wife is called מלכה, *i.e.* מלך, a common transformation of ירחמאל, with the feminine ending. Cp. on xiv. 2, xx. 2.

To the statement of these names the traditional text adds אבי מלכה ואבי יסכה. The repetition of אבי is surprising, in spite of the parallel in xiv. 13. What has caused it? May we regard יסכה as a variant to מלכה (cp. Ball)? And we must further ask, What can be the object of mentioning a second Milcah? The truth seems to be that here, as often (see on iv. 20), אבי comes from ערב = עבר. What מלכה means, we have seen. As to יסכה, it cannot possibly be another name for 'Sarai,' as some of the ancients thought (see Dillm.), nor a corruption of the Babylonian divine name Nusku. It is rather a corruption, either of סלכה (Dt. iii. 10), or of עכסה (Josh. xv. 16), both of which names may represent אשכל, *i.e.* אֶשֶׁר ירחמאל.[2] So that the double gloss on מלכה states that this name is equivalent both to Arab-Yeraḥme'el[3] and to Arab-Ashkal (Asshur-Yeraḥme'el). For a mythological explanation of Milcah see *KAT*, p. 364, and *E. Bib.*, *s.v.* I doubt whether this theory is tenable. Indeed, at this point I may take leave to say that the names in Gen. xi. appear to be all primarily N. Arabian. If any of them are also N. Aramæan or Mesopotamian, it must be because they were carried northward in migrations.

[1] Cp. Nestle, *ZATW*, 1905, p. 363.

[2] The only doubt is whether עכסה may not represent אסכר, and this אשחר.

[3] The name ער' יר' may underlie the mysterious עיר עמלק in 1 S. xv. 5.

THE THIRD AGE OF THE WORLD, BEGINNING WITH THE CALL AND MIGRATION OF ABRAM. (*For another view, see on chap. xvii.*)

CHAP. xii. 1-9. The call and migration of Abram.—10-20. His temporary sojourn in Miṣrim, his alarm on account of the supposed danger of his wife, and the wonderful circumstances arising out of his statement respecting Sarai and her being taken into the king's house.

Both narratives (which have only an artificial connexion) favour the view that their common hero is in the main an ideal personification of the people of Israel (including the as yet uncorrupted Yerahme'el). The Israelites felt assured of the greatness of their divinely appointed destiny—that is the formative idea of the first narrative. They remembered that they had dwelt for a time in Miṣrim; that memory evidently underlies the second story. The great sojourn connected with the name of Joseph and the little one connected with the name of Abram are fundamentally the same.

With regard to the former narrative, we may accept it as a symbolic expression of the belief that the migration of the benê Israel from Miṣrim had a religious origin—that it was, in fact, a kind of hejra,[1] directed by a prophetic personage, such as Moses or Abraham. It is more hazardous (considering the state of the evidence) to affirm that this religious movement of the benê Israel, believed in at a date long after the real or supposed events, is a historical fact, and even more so to say that it was connected (or supposed to be connected) with a religious revolution in Babylonia which placed Marduk at the head of the

[1] Jeremias, *ATAO*, p. 181.

gods.[1] It is undeniable, however, that we have in xii. 1-3 a religious justification of the occupation of the region called Canaan by the benê Israel, and of their recognition of Yahweh as the god of Canaan. Who Yahweh (historically speaking) was, where the original Canaan was, and whence Abram was supposed to have come, are questions which are not new to us, and the solution of which will become clearer the further we proceed.

Another of these questions is that which relates to 'Ur-Kasdim.' We may venture to hold that the solution at which we have arrived clears away a very real difficulty, pointed out by Steuernagel (*Einwand.* p. 67), viz. that whereas elsewhere the figure of Abram is constantly localised (as it would seem) in the south of Palestine, he is here 'transferred to the north.' Our solution also throws a new light on the text of the divine speech in *v.* 1. The accumulation of phrases, 'from thy land, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house' is unparalleled, and the question arises, both here and in xxiv. 7 (which, though not quite parallel, makes an approach to being one), whether there is an error in the text. Having before us the case of the error in xi. 28, where a gloss is attached to the phrase 'in the land of thy kindred,' we cannot think it unlikely that in xii. 1 the phrase 'from thy land and from thy kindred' should receive as an appendix almost the same gloss, viz. מִבֵּית עֵרָב, 'from the Arabian country.' The divine speech certainly gains by the omission of the third expression. (For the change, see on xxviii. 13, xlix. 4, 8).

There is yet another restoration which is brought close to us by the solution of the Ur-Kasdim problem. The text of the closing words of *v.* 1 suggests that Abram went out into the world not knowing his bourn. Yet if we will but reflect, such blind confidence in a director who withholds necessary information is not natural. Nor, indeed, is the phrase 'to the land which I will cause thee to see' as plain as we have a right to expect (contrast Ex. xxiii. 20, 23). And if we look at the context, can we avoid seeing that the person whom Yahweh addresses is aware of the name of the

[1] See Winckler, *Abraham als Babylonier*, etc. (1903), and cp. Cheyne, 'Babylon and the Bible,' *Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1903, pp. 65 *ff.*

region referred to? Doubtless we require a wide experience of textual phenomena to venture to make a restoration; but those who have followed me elsewhere have such an experience. We need not doubt that in the original text אשר was pronounced, not אֲשֶׁר, but אַשֻּׁר, and that אראך, like ארבע in xxiii. 2 and elsewhere, and אביך in *v.* 1, has come from a badly written עֶרֶב. What the original text made Yahweh say to his servant was this, 'Take thy way from thy land and from thy kindred to the land (read אֶרֶץ) of Asshur-ʿarâb (*i.e.* Arabian Asshur).[1]

Before passing on to the narrative, a word may be in place respecting the promise in *v.* 3*b*, which is commonly supposed to mean that all races of the world shall recognise the unique position of Abram and of his seed (cp. xviii. 18, xxviii. 14). A study of the prophetic writings in the light of a new textual criticism seems to me to suggest that the 'families' or 'tribes' (משפחות) meant in the original text were those of the regions bordering on S. Palestine. Cp. Am. iii. 2, which may probably be rendered, 'You only have I known of all the tribes of the land,' and note that in the original text of Ezek. xxxviii. *f.*, Isa. lxvi., Joel iv., Zech. xiv. the nations spoken of appear to be those 'round about' (Joel iv. 12), and that in Isa. xix. 24, Israel, Miṣrim, and Asshur (the two latter, N. Arabian regions) are represented as forming a triple alliance under the sanction of Israel's God.

And what follows next in the narrative? Abram sets out on his journey to that N. Arabian land of Canaan, which became afterwards the border-land of a greater Canaan. Being, according to the original legend, a Yeraḥme'elite patriarch, he knows the way. It is indeed the road which the merchants took, and one may remark in passing that it must be considerably easier than the route from the conventional Ḥaran to the conventional Canaan.[2] The land through which he passed (*v.* 6) was that called, as we have seen, Arabian Asshur. And it is remarkable that, by an archaism such as late writers not unfrequently indulge in, it

[1] Cp. Hos. v. 13, where 'Asshur' and 'Arâb' (so read) are parallel; also rev. text of chap. xlix., and other passages.

[2] For this, see Driver's note on xii. 4*b*.

is said of Abram, in Jubilees xiii. 1, that he 'came into Asshur, and proceeded to Shechem.'[1]

The statement in Genesis (*v.* 6) is, according to *KS*, that Abram 'passed through the land as far as to the place where Shechem stood afterwards, as far as to the terebinth of oracles.' The name Shechem often occurs in the early narratives (cp. xxxiii. 18 *ff.*, xxxiv., xxxv. 4, xlviii. 22, Josh. xxiv. 26). It is usually supposed to indicate the place now called Nāblus, eleven hours from Jerusalem on the great north road. That a place called Shechem anciently stood on the same site as Nāblus, cannot be doubted; indeed, according to Knutzon's reading of Am. Tab. 185, 10, there was a 'land of Šakm,' which may have belonged to the realm of Lapaya or Labaya, to the north of the kingdom of Abd-ḫiba of Jerusalem.[2] There are, however, good reasons derived from the contexts of the passages for suspecting that the Shechem of the O.T. narratives referred to was not here, but in the N. Arabian border-land. The singularity of the phrase מקום שכם ('the place,' or, as Di., Gu., Dr. render, 'the sanctuary of Shechem') cannot escape any one. It is only reasonable to criticise the text. The main difficulty lies in מקום. Now it so happens that מקום is several times elsewhere a corruption of ירחמאל; see *e.g.* Isa. xxviii. 8, xxxiii. 21, Ezek. xxxviii. 11 (followed by שם = ישמ׳), Hos. ii. 1, and especially perhaps Ezra viii. 17. This seems to be the case here. We have also (see on x. 2, 14) found that שכ, כש, and כם are often fragments of אשחר (the N. Arabian region so called), the tendency of the popular speech being to cut short names which have to be often pronounced, especially in compounds, and on the analogy of names such as בשור for ערב־שור and בשלם for ערב ישמ׳ (see on Ex. xxxi. 2) it is very possible that ם in שכם may be the remainder of רם = ארם. שכם therefore, being necessarily a N. Arabian name, most probably comes from שכרם,[3] and

[1] Dr. Charles, whose translation I quote, obelizes 'Asshur,' but this simply indicates a too natural prejudice. It is, at any rate, possible that the writer used a text of Genesis which was not in all points adjusted to the geographical theories of later scribes and editors.

[2] Cp. H. W. Hogg, *E. Bib.*, 'Ephraim,' § 7.

[3] Less probably שכם is a redactor's substitute for כֻּשָּׁם; see *E. Bib.*, 'Shechem,' § 2.

since the prefixed מקום is a disguise of 'Yeraḥme'el,' we get the compound name Yeraḥme'el-Shakram, which is, perhaps, not so much the name of a city as of a district (cp. 'the field of Abram' in Sheshonḳ's list; note on 'Abram,' xi. 27). Shakram itself, as we have seen, is a shortened form of Asḥhur-Arām. See, further, on 'Kasdim,' xi. 31.

The precise locality visited is called אלון מורה (cp. Dt. xi. 30). Did the writer really mean by this 'the oracle-giver's terebinth' (or 'sacred tree'), as if the priest attached to this tree knew the way to get oracles from the tree-deity? I do not, for my own part, deny that מורה may mean 'oracle-giver'[1] (see Siegfried-Stade, *Lex.*, under ירה and מורה); Mic. iii. 11 seems conclusive on this point. But I am not at all sure that we do well to trust the traditional reading. To deny (with the Dutch critic Dozy) that מורה can be a proper name, seems to me rash in the extreme. If ממרא in xiii. 18, xviii. 1, is a proper name, it is difficult not to regard מורה too as such. Both these words surely belong to one and the same group with מריה[2] (xxii. 2), מריה (Neh. xii. 12), מריות (Ezra vii. 3), מרים (Ex. ii. 4), מערה (Josh. xiii. 4); also with ארומה (Judg. ix. 41), ראומה (Gen. xxii. 24), ראמת (Josh. xix. 8), חמור (Gen. xxxiii. 19, etc.). The result is that both מורה here and ממרא in xiii. 18 come from popular distortions of ירחמאל.[3] It has been shown elsewhere (on Judg. ix. 37) that מעוננים (in אלון מ׳) has a similar origin, *i.e.* the *'êlon* of Yeraḥme'el corresponds to the *'êlon* of the Ishmaelites. On the situation of the tree, or trees, see note on Dt. xi. 30. Cp. also on Judg. vii. 1.

But more sacred sites have still to be claimed for Abram's God. So the patriarch moves camp, and journeys to a spot in the mountain-land, east of בית-אל (*v.* 8). Beyond doubt, there was anciently a northern Bethel

[1] That it can mean 'instruction,' *i.e.* 'knowledge' (Winckler, *AOF* xxi. 406), and that the cosmic tree of Shechem is referred to, is surely too fanciful.

[2] 𝔊 evidently connects the two names. In xii. 6 it gives *τὴν δρῦν τὴν ὑψηλήν*, in xxii. 2 *εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ὑψ.* Apparently in both places it read מראה (cp. ראמת, from ארם or ירחמאל).

[3] This gives the key to Ps. ix. 21, where מורה להם represents doubly ירחמאל; שיתה is a corruption of תשחית.

(attested by the modern name *Beitīn*). But is it this place —about ten miles N. of Jerusalem—which is here meant? Indeed, we may go further and ask whether it is certain that Bethel-Beitīn is meant elsewhere, *e.g.* in xxviii. 19, xxxv. 6, 15, Josh. xvi. 2, Judg. i. 22, iv. 5, xxi. 19, 1 K. xii. 29, Am. vii. 10, 13? Let the reader re-examine these passages in their contexts from our present point of view, and judge. The name itself indicates that a southern position is, in the first instance, to be thought of. For such a name as 'Beth-el' can hardly be still in its original form. 'Beth-Yerahme'el' might plausibly be suggested as the earlier name,[1] but much more probably בית־אל should be grouped with בתואל (xxii. 22), בתול (Josh. xix. 4), בעלת (Josh. xix. 44), בעלות (Josh. xv. 24), and לבאות (Josh. xv. 32), and all these names should be derived from אתבעל = ישמעאל.[2] A strong confirmation of this is furnished by the gloss in Hos. xii. 4 (rev. text), where it is explained that in the short reference to the contest between Jacob and Elohim it is the Arabian or Ishmaelite Bethel that is meant. Observe that according to xiii. 13 *f.* an extensive view over the whole country can be had from 'Beth-el.' This does not accord with facts, if we insist on supposing the northern 'Beth-el' to be referred to. For the companion-name הָעַי, see *Crit. Bib.* on Josh. vii. 2.

The next statement—that in *v.* 9—is due to the redactor, and with it goes xiii. 1, 3 *f.* The redactor supposed Abram to have journeyed southward.

We now come to the story of Abram and Sarai in מצרים (*vv.* 10-20), the difficulties of which have long been admitted, though the most important one was first recognised by Winckler (*AOF* i. 33). The reference to 'going down' into מ׳ (*v.* 10), and to פרעה (*vv.* 15 *ff.*) naturally suggests that the scene of the story is in Egypt (מִצְרַיִם), and yet it is beyond doubt that in the other versions of the same original it is laid in Gerar (chap. xx., Abraham; chap. xxvi., Isaac). How is this to be explained? Winckler supposes that in chap. xii. J[2] misunderstands, and confounds מצר with

[1] See *Crit. Bib.* on Am. vii. 9 *f.*

[2] Notice that Jubilees xiii. 10 states that Abram went 'into the land of the south to Bealoth' (*i.e.* Ethbaal).

מצרים. I could not deny that this is both possible and plausible. But, on the other hand, it is strange that there is so little genuine Egyptian colouring in the narrative. I know, indeed, that פַּרְעֹה (*φαραω*) is commonly explained as a Hebraised form of the expression for 'king' used by the later Egyptians, the early form of which (*Per'o*) meant 'the great house,' 'the palace.'[1] But there are several objections to this view. (1) The Hebrew vocalisation is not quite what one would expect (see W. M. Müller). (2) Shishaḳ, So, Tirhaḳah are without the prefix פרעה; only Necoh and Hophra have it. If 'Pharaoh' were the adopted Hebrew expression for 'king of Egypt,' why is it omitted in those cases? To tell us that in Egypt, down to the twenty-second dynasty, the Egyptian term always occurs without a proper name, is not to the point. We are concerned with what is supposed to be an adopted Hebrew term. (3) In numerous passages, *e.g.* Ex. vi. 11, Dt. vii. 8, 1 K. ix. 16, Ezek. xxix, 2 *f.*, etc., we meet with the expression 'Pharaoh king of מצרים,' as if 'Pharaoh' were a proper name. Cp. also פרעה, 1 Chr. iv. 18 *b*. (4) There are in the O.T. several words resembling פרעה, such as פרעות, פרעתון, פראם, which at any rate suggest the reasonableness of seeking first of all to explain פרעה from Semitic. (5) The other Semitic languages have not accepted Par'oh (Pharaoh) in any form as an expression for the king of Egypt.

From the N. Arabian point of view the origin of פרעה is not difficult to find. It comes most probably from Pir'u, the name (as we may suppose) of some Miṣrite king who became famous. At any rate, it was the name of a king of Muṣri in Sargon's time—the phrase is Pir'u šar Muṣri, which corresponds exactly to פרעה מלך מצרים. Another form of פרעה is possibly פראם (Josh. x. 3), where the ם may be due, as Hommel suggests, to Arabic 'mimation.'[2] These and all the other parallel names quoted above may ultimately have come from ערף = עֶרֶב (see on 'Arpakshad,' x. 22); the explanation of Pir'u as 'shoot,' 'offspring,' is less probable. Of course, the view that פרעה is not a Hebraised Egyptian

[1] See W. M. Müller, *E. Bib.*, 'Pharaoh,' § 1.

[2] פראם may, however, have come from אפרים (on which see note on xli. 52).

title meaning 'king' but a N. Arabian personal royal name will only be certain (practically) when it has been shown that Shishaḳ, So, Tirhaḳah, Necoh, Hophra (whether expressly called 'Pharaoh' or not) were really kings of Muṣri.[1]

Next, as to the danger encountered by Sarai in מצרים. There is no temptation to deny that a king of Egypt might have coveted the possession of a beautiful Asiatic woman; a conservative scholar[2] refers in this connexion to King Abd-ḫiba's present of twenty-one female slaves to his Egyptian suzerain. But can we suppose that there would have been less danger for Sarai in an Arabian kingdom?

Much more important is the expression 'Abram *went down* into מצרים' (*v.* 10), and the implied statement that מ' is a corn-land. This looks very much like a reference to Egypt. Was it introduced by the redactor? If so, he left a good deal that is adverse to his theory. And if we admit this, we must also admit that this and other redactors made similar interferences with the text elsewhere (see especially the Joseph-story). Certainly this appears to be the fairest hypothesis that we can frame. It does not require us to deny that there were fruitful parts of N. Arabia, and that the ancestors of the Israelites sojourned there, and it enables us to account for phrases and for elements in the descriptions which can hardly otherwise be explained. And yet even here a doubt forces itself upon us; for in Num. xi. 5, where the text is plainly wrong, must we not read thus,[3] 'We remember the corn (דַּגָּן) which we ate in Miṣrim' (gloss, חנם, *i.e.* Yaḥman, Yeraḥme'el), and in 2 K. xviii. 32 is it not the king of the N. Arabian Asshur who declares that he will take the Jews away to 'a land of corn and wine'? Even if the latter be due to a redactor who knows only of a king of Assyria, yet the former remains. Here is a real problem (see on chap. xl.).

At any rate, the claims of מִצְרַיִם are upset by the

[1] See *Crit. Bib.* It may be noticed here that חפרע (Hophra) in Jer. xliv. 30 is merely a corrupt dittograph of פרעה, and that פרעה נכה (Ph. Necoh) in 2 K. xxiii. 29 may have come from פראו חָנָה.

[2] Heyes, *Bib. u. Aeg.* p. 18 (Am. Tab. 181, 20-22).

[3] The second half of the verse consists apparently of miswritten names of peoples. See on Ex. xii. 38.

reference to camels in *v.* 16, at least if the text reading is correct. For 'the assertion that the ancient Egyptians knew the camel is unfounded.'[1] Most probably, however, גמלים in *v.* 16 comes from ירחמאלים; cp. on xxxvii. 25, Judg. vi. 5, viii. 21; also גמדים in Ezek. xxvii. 11. This correction, however, is insufficient; 'he-asses, and men-servants, and maid-servants, and she-asses, and camels' is an impossible sequence. The difficulty was very early felt, hence in Sam. חמרים is transposed, so as to stand before ואת׳. The truth is, however, that אתנת (as in Judg. v. 10) represents either איתנים or אתבנים, both of which ultimately come from ישמעאלים. Thus the last two words in *v.* 16 are glosses on עבדים. The slaves given by the king to Abram were, it is stated, Ishmaelites or Yeraḥme'elites. Thus one more textual difficulty which has long baffled us is explained. Similar corrections are required in the parallel passages, xxiv. 35, xxx. 43.

In conclusion, I do not see that this story favours the view that Abram was a missionary or a representative of a higher and purer religion. It is simply a glorification of the great ancestor of Israel, with perhaps a glance (but the parallelism is by no means close) at the plagues preceding the Exodus. At the same time, the fact that Abram and the Miṣrite king have the same religion (cp. on chap. xx.), as well as apparently the same language, reminds us of the lofty anticipation of a late Hebrew prophet (Isa. xix. 24 *f.*) that Miṣrim, Asshur, and Israel—the three great Yeraḥme'elite peoples—should one day become a blessing to all around them, and be blessed in equal measure by Yahweh. I would also add the suggestion that the statement that Sarai was at once Abram's sister and his wife makes it not impossible that Abram was originally represented as nearer than he now appears to the origin of the human race.

[1] W. M. Müller, *E. Bib.*, col. 634; cp. 1209. Heyes disputes this assertion (*Bib. u. Aeg.* pp. 28 *ff.*), which, however, is supported by Maspero and Erman.

THE CHOICES OF ABRAM AND LOT
(GEN. XIII. 2, 5-18)

THE two righteous men—Abram and Loṭ—are compelled to separate. One of them excels the other in generosity, but this is necessary for the narrative, and we do not find that the more selfish one is blamed. At any rate, when it comes to the point, Loṭ, like Abram, proves himself a man of faith. It is plausible (cp. on xiv. 12) to hold that originally Abram and Loṭ were brothers. Pairs of brothers abound in ancient legend; hardly a people in nearer Asia and in Europe is without its Dioscuri. Often they are hostile (*e.g.* Romulus and Remus), but we cannot venture to draw a hard and fast line between friendly and hostile brothers.[1]

Let us begin our closer investigation at two rather important glosses, viz. *v.* 7 *b* and *v.* 10. The first, which may perhaps be misplaced (Gunkel), reminds us that Abram was only a sojourner among the Canaanites. 'And the Perizzite' is a gloss within the gloss; פרזי (surely not peasant-tribe) probably comes from צרפי = צרפתי (cp. צרפים, Neh. iii. 32). 'Canaanites' and 'Ṣarephathites,' then, are synonymous. The Canaanites were, in fact, a branch of the Yeraḥme'elites, with whom the Ṣarephathites may be identified. Cp. xxxiv. 30, Judg. i. 4 *f.*; in Judg. i. 3, 'Canaanites' occurs alone. Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Perizzites.'

The second gloss (*v.* 10) is twofold; it consists of two of the four defining clauses, viz. (1) לפני שחת וגו׳, and (2) כארץ מצרים. (Note the warning Paseḳ after לפני). Both these are superfluous interruptions, and yet instructive. It is true that Abram and Loṭ knew nothing of the impending

[1] Stucken, *Astralmythen*, p. 87.

catastrophe of the cities. For us, however, the insertion (for such it must be) is of the greatest interest, for taken in connexion with the second clause (כגן יהוה) it suggests that Sodom and Gomorrah were in the vicinity of the region in which early tradition located the lost Paradise (see on ii. 4 *b*, etc.). The second clause itself is altogether in the naïve manner of the narrator, who thoroughly believes in the garden of Yahweh, in accordance with the early tradition. The third clause, כארץ מצרים, though a gloss, is not inane, for the 'land of Miṣrim,' by its relative fertility, probably gave the best idea of what the 'circle (district) of the Yarḥon' might be supposed to have been in the days of Abram and Loṭ. And at any rate, according to the authority used by P (x. 6), Miṣrim and Canaan (originally a southern name) were both 'sons' of Ḥam (Yerahme'el). Whether the following words, באכה צער, belong to כארץ מ׳, is uncertain.[1] An affirmative answer is possible, for צער (so read, not צען)[2] has possibly come by popular corruption from מצור (see on xix. 20), *i.e.* a place-name Miṣṣor. Dt. xxxiv. 3, however, suggests a different connexion. That passage, critically revised, closes with the words, 'Arabramathim (virtually = Yerahme'el) as far as Ṣoar.' According to this, Ṣoar was, in one direction, the limit of the Yerahme'elite region.

Can any one reasonably doubt that מצרים here is the land of Muṣri in N. Arabia? It may be only a gloss which mentions the name, but the glossators in many parts of the O.T. are aware of the N. Arabian connexion of the Israelites. And the mention of Muṣri confirms the view that other N. Arabian names occur in the preceding gloss.

And what, according to the narrator himself, were the

[1] Winckler (*KAT*[3], p. 146) remarks, 'מצרים by Zoar; therefore Muṣri.' See also *E. Bib.*, col. 4672, 'like the land of Miṣrim in the direction of Miṣṣor.'

[2] צען is read by Ebers, Geiger, and Ball (after Pesh.); like most moderns they identify 'Zoan' with Tanis in Egypt. It is not impossible even for us to adopt this reading, for there was a 'Zoan' in the N. Arabian Muṣri (see on Num. xiii. 22). צען is, in fact, one of the early popular corruptions of ישמעאל (like צאן in xxxvii. 2, 1 S. xvi. 11, and צאנן in Mic. i. 11). The intermediate form may be צבען; see on xxxvi. 2.

respective regions of Abram and Loṭ, or, more strictly, the regions where they respectively sojourned (*vv.* 10-12)? Loṭ, deficient in generosity, chose 'all the *kikkar* of the Jordan.' ירדן (Jordan), however, must be due to a scribe who lived when the scene of this and many other narratives had become thoroughly misconceived. The original text had יַרְחֹן. It deserves the attention of critics that, in certain passages, we still find the error and the correction side by side, *e.g.* Num. xxii. 1, Josh. xvi. 1, 1 Ch. vi. 63. Yarḥon appears to have been the name of a border stream (or was it merely a large torrent?) in the N. Arabian borderland; cp on xv. 7-18. This region is eulogised as 'well-watered everywhere.' Sodom, then, was in Yarḥonite or Yeraḥme'elite territory.—In *v.* 10 four defining clauses are given; these we need not consider over again. Geographically, the important point is that the region called the *kikkar* extended to Zoar (cp. on xix. 20-22). But what does *kikkar* mean? As all agree, 'circle' or 'district' (𝔊 ἡ περίχωρος). The question, however, is whether this was the original meaning. In 1 K. vii. 46 (viewed in relation to the whole story of the artificer Hiram) it appears that ככר represents ירחם or ירחן (הירדן, *i.e.* הירחן, follows בככר), and elsewhere רק and רקון are corruptions of ירחם (= ירחמאל). The probability is that there was a once fertile district in the border-land which bore a name corrupted at an early date from Rakman, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el. This name sometimes, and quite naturally, stood alone, *i.e.* as [הַ]כִּכָּר; sometimes, however, הירחון, 'the Yarḥon,' was added, to determine the reference more precisely.

One is surprised to hear (*v.* 12) that Loṭ, after his separation from Abram, 'dwelt in the *cities* of the kikkar,' and equally so to be told *next* that 'Loṭ pitched his tents (?) as far as Sodom.' An explanation can, however, be given. ערי, as in the same phrase elsewhere (xix. 29), comes from עֲרַב.[1] The original text had 'in Arabia of the *kikkar*' (or, perhaps, of Yeraḥme'el). And in the phrase ויאהל עד־סדם, אהל, as elsewhere (*e.g.* 1 K. vii. 45), represents a

[1] Note that 𝔊 in our passage presupposes בעיר, and that both עיר (cp. Dt. xxxiv. 2) and ערי (cp. Judg. xii. 7) occur as corruptions of עֲרָב.

shortened form of ירחמאל (there is no denominative verb),[1] and the prefixed וי represents הוא, 'that is,' while עד, as *e.g.* in xix. 37 *f.*, comes from ערב = ער'. *V.* 12 *b* therefore runs, 'and Loṭ dwelt in Arabia of the *kikkar*; that is, Yeraḥme'el; Arabia of Sodom.'

One thing more is said about Loṭ, but the text is again corrupt. ויסע לוט מקדם (*v.* 11) is usually rendered 'and Loṭ journeyed eastward,' but מקדם can hardly mean 'eastward.' Stade (*ZATW*, 1894, p. 276, note 2) and Gunkel would read קֵדְמָה, but this is arbitrary, and, besides, such an isolated correction is inadequate. ויסעלוט seems to have come from הוא ישמעאל (וי = הוא, see above), 'that is, Ishmael,' which is a gloss on 'all the kikkar of the Yarḥon.' As in ii. 8, מקדם is an expansion of יקדם, *i.e.* ירחם, 'Yarḥam,' which is an alternative gloss on 'kikkar.'

As for Abram, he certainly dwells in the land of Canaan (see on x. 6). Before moving on, he enjoys a wide survey of the promised land, probably from the mountain spoken of in xii. 8. Then he is led on his way by his unseen Guide to the sacred tree (read באלון; cp. xii. 6, and see on xviii. 1) of Mamre, which is by Ḥebron, and built an altar to Yahweh (*v.* 18), *i.e.* the altar which existed there in the time of the narrator (Gunkel). The sequel of *v.* 18 is the famous narrative (chaps. xviii., xix.) which tells how Abram was visited by the divine ones at Ḥebron, and Loṭ at Sodom.

And what does *Mamre* mean? According to Ed. Meyer, 'the name still mocks at every attempt at explanation' (p. 267). Surely this is a mistake. The word ממרא is no harder to explain than מורה (see on xii. 6, and cp. on מערת, xxiii. 9). Probably it is a transformation of ראמן, which is a popular corruption of ירחמאל. It now becomes easy to explain the troublesome ויאהל (*v.* 18; cp. on *v.* 12). It is, again, corrupt, and has come from הוא ירחמ', 'that is, Yeraḥme'el'; אברם, which follows, may either have been transferred redactionally from its original place after ויבא, or represent a complementary ערבים. 'That is, Yeraḥme'el

[1] *BDB* give this statement, 'אהל, vb. denom., tent, move tent from place to place, Gen. xiii. 12, 18; Pi., יַהֵל, pitch one's tent, Isa. xiii. 20.' But all these passages are undoubtedly corrupt. In the third, יהל comes from יהל' = יַהֲלֹךְ; 𝔊 διέλθωσιν, cp. Lam. v. 18.

of Arabia' is a gloss on ממרא, a word which in xxxv. 27 is again furnished with an explanatory gloss. See also on xiv. 13.—For *Ḥebron*, see on xxiii. 2. If the name comes ultimately from an ethnic or tribe-name, we may well suppose that there were two Ḥebrons—one the modern *el-Ḫalîl*, the other in the N. Arabian border-land (cp. Josh. xv. 44, 1 Chr. ii. 42),—and that each of these had its own sacred tree or trees.

A NEST OF NEW PROBLEMS (GEN. XIV.)

ABRAM as a great chief and warrior, a devout worshipper, and a loyal friend and ally.

The peculiarities of this narrative, by which it contrasts both with the preceding and with the following narratives of J and E, have often been noted with surprise. No other passage of Genesis, except, indeed, xxxvi. 31-39, has so much the outward appearance of being derived from a national chronicle as xiv. 1-11, so that Kittel[1] has not unnaturally suggested that it may be an *uralt* Canaanite record, and Ed. Meyer[2] that the historical facts of the setting of the story must have been obtained by the late Jewish author in Babylon. Sayce,[3] too, has long since expressed the opinion that the whole narrative in Gen. xiv. was 'extracted from the Babylonian archives,' and has given 'an approximate date for the rescue of Loṭ by Abraham, and consequently for the age of Abraham himself.' He thus sanctions the opinion of Renan[4] that in Gen. xiv. we

[1] *Gesch. der Hebräer*, i. 158 (1888).
[2] *GA* i. 166 (1884).
[3] See *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, pp. 53-59.
[4] *Histoire d'Israel*, ii. 210.

have 'sorte de fenêtre ouverte sur la plus haute antiquité.' And not only is he still unmoved by adverse criticisms, but he has quite lately developed his view further on the lines of a more advanced cuneiform research.[1] The most important of his theses are these:—(1) The Hebrew text of Gen. xiv. is a translation or paraphrase of a cuneiform original. (2) The Babylonian proper names have been handed down with remarkable correctness, indicating (*a*) that the same care was taken in Canaan in copying older documents as in Babylonia and Assyria, (*b*) that the Hebrew translator was conscientious, and (*c*) that the Hebrew text is on the whole to be trusted. (3) As the use of the so-called Phœnician alphabet in Palestine and Phœnicia cannot be traced archæologically beyond the age of David or Samuel, the Hebrew translation of the cuneiform original may have been made then. The official records of Israel may have perished in the destruction of Shiloh by the Philistines. The new alphabet, and probably also the use of the native language, may have been introduced among the Israelites under Samuel, as they seem to have been at Tyre under Abibal and Hiram I.

To prove (1), it will be necessary to show that throughout Genesis there are not only names, but expressions, which cannot be adequately explained save by the hypothesis that they have come from Babylonian sources, and in some cases at any rate from cuneiform Babylonian tablets. To prove (2), that the names, or most of them, can be explained, without violence, from Babylonian. To prove (3), or at least make it highly probable, we must find some Israelitish cuneiform tablets prior to the presumed date of the destruction of Shiloh.

A somewhat similar view has been put forward by Winckler,[2] combined with a remarkable critical analysis of the narrative. According to this scholar, Gen. xiv., in its original form, is based upon a Babylonian historical legend which had probably taken the form of a hymn dealing with

[1] 'The Archæology of Genesis xiv.,' *Exp. Times*, Aug. 1906, pp. 498-503.

[2] *Gesch. Isr.* ii. 26-42; *AOF*, 3rd ser., i. 165-174; *Kritische Schriften*, Heft 2, p. 116.

Kedorlaomer and Tidʿal, the two oppressors of Babylonia, who, after having conquered the Amorites at a place identified by the Hebrew writer as Haṣaṣon-Tamar, were themselves defeated by a chief of the Ḫabiri.[1] This hymn or legend had some mythological elements, signs of which are the number 318 (*v.* 14), and the names 'the valley of spirits' (*vv.* 3, 8, 10; Siddim corrupted from *shêdîm*), 'the fountain of judgment' (Ên-Mishpât, *v.* 7), and 'the king's valley' (ʿêmeḳ sharê, *v.* 17). These three mythical localities were identified by the Israelitish author of Gen. xiv. in its original form with places in his native land. Naturally enough, Winckler finds traces of the Babylonian origin of the story, not only in the proper names, but in the vocabulary, *e.g.* וידך (MT. וירך), *v.* 14, from Ass. *idḳi*, 'he mustered'; ויחלק, *v.* 15, from Ass. *ḫalâḳu*, 'to flee' (Piel, 'to fall upon'); שרה (MT. שוה), *v.* 17, from Ass. *sharru*, 'king.'

As to the use of cuneiform among the Israelites, it went on, according to Winckler, in the political sphere most probably till the time of Hezekiah. In literature, however, the use of alphabetic writing began somewhat earlier, for the work of the Elohist, which is referred to the reign of Ahaz, was the first connected specimen of alphabetic writing of which we know. This, as Winckler thinks, may illustrate the strange phrase in Isa. viii. 1, 'Take thee a great tablet, and write on it with an ordinary stilus' (בחרט אנוש), *i.e.* in Phœnician or Aramaic characters. The antithesis to ח׳ א׳ (lit. 'stilus of men') is חרט אלהים, *i.e.* hieratic writing (see Ex. xxxi. 18, xxxii. 16).[2]

I must confess, however, that even Winckler, who elsewhere (*e.g.* on Judg. v.) appears so free from the Massoretic superstition, shows a surprising unsuspiciousness in dealing with the received text of Gen. xiv. Surely, before either Sayce or Winckler had propounded his theories, he ought to have given a keen criticism to the traditional text. I have already referred to this subject not long since,[3] but shall naturally treat it here in more detail.

[1] Cp. *v.* 15, 'Abram the Hebrew.'

[2] For a rival view, see on Ex. xxxii. 16.

[3] See *Bible Problems* (1904), pp. 146-150.

The first question of importance relates to the names of kings in *v.* 1. Can any of them, when brought as near as may be to their original form, be identified with the names of historical kings revealed by exploration? Even upon the Assyriological side some hesitation has begun to be visible.[1] To compare the names given by a Hebrew scribe, not contemporary with the events which are supposed to be referred to, with those of a learned Babylonian tablet-writer does indeed appear a somewhat hazardous undertaking.

Let us begin with אמרפל (𝔊 Αμαρφαλ), the bearer of which name is still very commonly identified with Ḫammurabi, the great unifier of Babylonia and conqueror of Elam. The difficulty is that no such name has yet been found in the inscriptions. The final ל is especially puzzling. Lindl has suggested that it may perhaps represent the Babylonian *ilu*, 'god.' This, however, would be too far-fetched, even if there were much stronger reason than there is to expect a reference to Ḫammurabi. Hüsing, therefore, who is followed by Winckler and Erbt, proposed to prefix the troublesome ל to the following word, producing לְמֶלֶךְ, which, of course, involves some other alterations of the text, and is not very plausible. It is necessary, therefore, to consult a fairly wide experience of the habits of Hebrew scribes. That פ and ב are often confounded, especially in proper names, will be admitted. It follows that פל, פעל, may very easily have come from בל, בעל; cp. פרא, xvi. 12, and עפר, xxv. 4, from עֲרָב, and see on 'Rephaim,' *v.* 5. The same confusion of letters accounts for the personal names פול, פלוא, ישפן. Nor are these the only changes which these and similar forms have undergone. ישפן, for instance, is a corruption of ישמעאל (cp. אחבן, אשבן), and both בל and בעל in proper names are not original, but represent מל and מעל (מאל). אמר, it is true, may be sup-

[1] Bezold, for instance, questions the identification of 'Amraphel' with Ḫammurabi. See also Johns, 'The Name Jehovah,' etc., *Expositor*, October 1903. This article is highly damaging to the popular views which rest so largely on the authority of Sayce, a gifted scholar whose hypotheses by no means always prove correct. Nevertheless, Sayce reaffirms his position in his article 'The Chedorlaomer Tablets' (based on a new transliteration and translation of the texts), *PSBA*, Nov. 1906, and following numbers.

posed to have the right letters, but here a popular metathesis is at least equally plausible, so that אמרפל (cp. ארבאל, Hos. x. 14), through the linking forms אמרבל and אמרמל, may have ultimately come from ירחמאל. I hold this to be more than slightly plausible. For the repeated מ in אמרמל, cp. on מלמד, Judg. 31 iii. (*Crit. Bib.*).

שנער too should now cease to vex the critic. Having seen that 'Amraphel' is not the name of a Babylonian king, we no longer wonder why such an 'obscure' name as Shinar should be preferred to 'Bâbel.' As has been shown (on x. 10), שנער represents ישמ׳ עֲרָב, 'Arabian Ishmael.'

Next as to אריוך. Is this really correct? Can we venture to interpret it as 'servant of the moon-god'?[1] Does וך really come from the Sumerian *Aku*? A thorough textual criticism compels us to trace אריוך to אשחור (cp. next footnote). The same explanation is required for the 'Ariok' of Dan. ii. 14 *f.*, 24 *f.*, Judith i. 6;[2] also in Judith v. 5, etc., for 'Achior,' the leader of all the sons of Ammon, and perhaps in Tobit i. 21 for 'Achiacharus,' the cup-bearer of 'Sarchedonus' at 'Nineveh,' for which name we should doubtless read 'Achicarus' = אחיקר.[3] All these parallels are of interest, and if they suggest changes in the received higher criticism, we ought not to mind this. Observe that in Tobit xiv. 15 א* substitutes 'Achiacharus' for 'Nabuchodonosor' (B) or 'Asuerus' (A), and that אחשורוש almost certainly comes from אשחור (the underlying reading in Esth. i. 1, etc., Ezra iv. 6, Dan. ix. 1). The only doubt is whether אחיקר, like אחיקם (2 K. xxii. 12, etc.), has not come from אש׳ ירחמ׳ (Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el). See note 3. Probably, indeed, this is the origin of Aḥiḳar, but even so the name is partly parallel to אריוך. See next paragraph.

[1] 'Whether Ariok goes back to a Sumerian pronunciation, Eri-Aku, of the Semitic-Babylonian name of Rôm-Sin, king of Larsa, is extremely uncertain' (Zimmern, *KAT*(3), p. 367). This is a very moderate statement (see Johns, *op. cit.* p. 285).

[2] The underlying texts of Daniel and Judith presuppose a different history and geography from that in the present texts. In Judith *l.c.* ὁ βασ. Ἐλυμαίων represents מלך עילם, *i.e.* a combination of two ordinary popular corruptions of ירחמאל. The real name of the plain (עמק or שדה) was Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el. 'Esther' too has been much altered.

[3] Cp. עכר (𝔊B, Pesh., Josh. vii. 1, 1 Chr. ii. 7, 4 Esd. vii. 37), probably from אשכר = אש׳ ירחמ׳. See also on ארך Gen. x. 10.

We now come to אלסר, where 'Ariok,' or rather 'Ashḥur,' ruled. It is said that this is rather like Larsa, the name of the Babylonian city of the sun-god, one of whose ancient kings was called Rim-sin, or, in Sumerian, Eri-aku. For some reason—Assyriological critics suppose—the old Hebrew writer used by preference the less natural name Eri-aku, which has become Ariok, while *âl Larsam* (Ball) has become 'Ellasār.' Into what sore straits we may be led by our inveterate textual conservatism! The truth surely is that אל׳ is a corruption of תלאשר, *i.e.* תּוּבַל אֵשֶׁר (Tubal [*i.e.* Ethbaal] of Asshur). See on 2 K. xix. 12.

Of כדרלעמר Strack (1905) says, 'All that is certain is that K. is a good Elamitish name.' Similarly most of the scholars who are in touch with Assyriologists. It has not yet been shown that it is a genuine historical name,[1] and, 'singularly enough,' the name of the Elamite goddess Lagamar 'never occurs in Elamite proper names.'[2] And to an experienced eye it will be at once clear that לעמר is to be grouped with אמרפל and עמרה, *i.e.* represents ירחמאל; כדר, too, is not of Elamite origin, but comes from בדד, which in xxxvi. 35 is the name of the father of a king of Edom (Aram?), probably = Bir-dadda = Arab-hadad.—But if so, what becomes of עילם? The question is answered by x. 22, where 'Elam' is one of the sons of 'Shem,' *i.e.* Ishmael, and is followed by 'Asshur.' The name is, beyond reasonable doubt, a popular modification of ירחמאל, which acquired an independent existence.—תדעל (most precariously explained by Assyriology)[3] is not so easy to explain. Probably, however, it should be grouped with תולד (1 Chr. iv. 29), אלתולד (Josh. xix. 4). This suggests a connexion with תובל or תובאל, *i.e.* אתבעל = ישמ׳ (see on xxii. 22). What other explanation of 'Tolad' and 'Eltolad' can be given is not apparent. It will be noticed

[1] See Tiele in *E. Bib.*, 'Chedorlaomer.' Erbt (*Die Hebr.* p. 67) makes Kedorla'omer come from Kudurmabuk; the Hebrew writer misread his (supposed) cuneiform authority. Truly 'necessity is the mother of invention.' Sayce, however, still reads Ku-dur-lakhkha-mar (*op. cit.*, 1906).

[2] Hommel, *Gr.* p. 361, note 7 (see his explanation of the circumstance).

[3] See King, *Letters of Ḫammurabi*, i. p. liii.

that in Josh. *l.c.* 'Eltolad' is followed by 'Bethul,' *i.e.* 'Tubal.'—גוים should be the name of the realm of Tidʿal (Tubal?). Does it come from Gutium = the land of the Guti or Ḳuti, a nomadic people north of Elam,[1] whose name has been traced by Delitzsch (but, as can be shown, wrongly) in the קוע of Ezek. xxiii. 23?[2] But the name of a king of Gutium certainly contemporary with Ḥammurabi, who is supposed to be = Imraphel, has yet to be found (Johns). And how can we take *this* occurrence of גוים as a district-name apart from those in Josh. xii. 23, Judg. iv. 2, Isa. viii. 23? There is only one theory which is consistent with a thoroughly critical view of all these passages in their contexts. גוים must represent either גלים (געלים, גלעדים) or גמרים (cp. גמדים, Ezek. xxvii. 11), or perhaps גמר (see on x. 2). The first of these corrections has the support of Pesh., but the second or third best suits the correction of 'Tidʿal' (or Tirʿal) into 'Tubal.'

One point still remains. The text of *v.* 1 as it stands gives an anacoluthon. The correction suggested by Hüsing and Winckler (see above) not being satisfactory, it seems best to follow Clericus and Ewald (*Komp. der Gen.* p. 221), and insert אברם after בימי.[3] How easily this might drop out before אמרפל or אמרמל need hardly be said.

Thus *v.* 1 will run thus, 'It befell in the days of Abram that Amarmel king of Shinar, Ashḥur king of Tubal-Asshur, Birdad-ʿAmral king of Elam, Tubal king of Gomer . . .' The question is, however, whether the original story mentioned more than one great king and one minor king, viz. Birdad-ʿAmral king of Elam and Tubal king of Gomer, both being rulers of different portions of the wide Yeraḥme'elite region. Observe that in *v.* 5 no king but 'Kedorlaomer' is mentioned). If so, the other names (except Tubal king of Gomer, if this is the right reading) were invented by a redactor[4]—surely no hard task—to make

[1] See Rogers, *Outlines of Babylonian History*, p. 10.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Koa,' and cp. 'Tidal.'

[3] So *E. Bib.*, 'Sodom,' § 6*c* (1903). So, in 1905, doubtfully Sievers ('Abram the Hebrew' not excluded).

[4] Winckler also (*GI* ii. 30) assumes that the lists of names have been amplified.

the campaign a grander business. Hence his further insertion in *v.* 5, 'and the kings that were with him'; hence, too, his misreading of an earlier gloss as 'four kings against the five.'

Verse 2, as the text now stands, informs us that five kings stood on the other side (cp. Josh. x. 5, 'the five kings of the Amorites'). The original story, however, may have mentioned only one great king (cp. *v.* 17) and perhaps one minor king. As in *v.* 1, the names are both mutilated and corrupted, except perhaps ברע, which is best accounted for by metathesis; read עֵרֶב, and compare the Midianite name רבע, Num. xxxi. 8, noting also among the accompanying names רקם (= ירחם) and חור (= אשחור).—Next ברשע. This is analogous to ברדד, and = עֵרֶב ישמעאל (cp. בעשא from אבשע, *i.e.* עֵרֶב ישמ׳).—שנאב (followed by a warning Pasek) and שמאבר may, of course, have been inserted by the editor, without his having known their origin. But they may also (cp. on בלע, below) be two notes which have come from the margin, variants to שנער (note that for שנאב 𝔊 gives *σενναap*, Sam. שנאר). All these three forms really represent עֵרֶב ישמעאל (cp. on אשנב, Judg. v. 28). A parallel form to שמאבר is probably the name Sumu-abi, borne by the founder of Ḥammurabi's dynasty, which has also come from ישמ׳ ערב; cp. also Urumilki, name of king of Gebal (*temp.* Sennacherib, which is = עֵרֶב ירחמ׳.[1]

We now turn to the place-names. First, סדם. An obscure name, which has evidently been worn down from some name both longer and more intelligible. Probably, as in the case of משך (see on x. 2), the initial letter has been lost, and the original form was חסרם, *i.e.* אַשְׁחֻר אֶרֶם. There is probable evidence that 'Sodom' was sometimes actually called Yerahme'el-Ashḥur, and, more shortly, Ashḥur (see on xix. 4, 9); also for the existence of a parallel form Kasram. For the latter, see Isa. i. 7*b*-9. Here several corrections are forced upon us. The words כמעט כסדם have arisen out of כמהפכת כסרם, and the same account must be given of כמהפ׳ זרים, which probably stood in the margin as a *correction* of כמהפ׳ כסרם. The preceding word ושממה

[1] Sayce has already explained שמאבר as 'perhaps a corrupt reading for Sumu-abi' (*Exp. Times*, x. 463).

probably comes from הוא ירושלם, which was a gloss upon בת־ציון (*v.* 8).[1] We have already seen (on xi. 31) that כשדים is another corruption of חשרם, *i.e.* אשחר ארם.—עמרה, the companion-name, is, of course, not from Ar. *ġamara*, 'texit rem aquâ,' but, like עמרי (1 K. xvi. 16), מערה (xxiii. 9, etc.), and רעמה (x. 7), comes from ארם or ירחמאל. It is therefore virtually = סדם, and may even be the legendary double of that name.—And what of אדמה and צביים (Sam. צבאים)? Have they come in from Hos. xi. 8, where it is not absolutely certain that the legend of Gen. xix. is referred to (cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Admah and Zeboim')? Or may they not be variants to עמרה and סדם? For אדמה is clearly = ארמה, *i.e.* אֲרָם (ירחמ') with the feminine ending, and צביים (צבאים) belongs to a group of words representing ישמעאל (see on 1 S. xiii. 18).—בלע, like בעל, probably comes from a truncated ישמ' (see on xi. 9, xxxvi. 32, and on בלעם, Num. xxii. 5). The question is whether בלע (perhaps the original of בבל, when this name is applied to a N. Arabian city or region, see on xi. 9) is not, like שנאב and שמאבר, a gloss on שנער in *v.* 1. Note the statement in the Book of Jubilees (x. 25, Charles) that the name Bâbel was given to 'the whole land of Shinar.'—היא־צער. The first of the geographical glosses. It is possible, however, to read צען, which is really an Ishmaelite name (see above, p. 227, note 2). Similarly, in the gloss in xxviii. 19, לז, *i.e.* ישמ' (cp. on אוזל, x. 27), is virtually = בית־אל (from אתבעל = ישמעאל).

As to *v.* 3, it is conceivable that it may be a redactional insertion, consequent on the expansion of *v.* 2. But the awkwardness of כל־אלה (if referred only to the kings in *v.* 2) and the unexpected 'pregnant construction' חברו אל, besides the premature reference to the עמק השדים, might well give us pause. Is there 'no balm in Gilead, no physician there'? Surely there is. Many analogies suggest that חברו אל covers over an ethnic ending in אל, and what should this be but (in the plural, to suit אלה) ירחמאלים? It is a gloss that we have before us—'all these (viz. all the kings mentioned in *vv.* 1 and 2) are Yeraḥme'elites.' עמק השדים was inserted from *v.* 8 after ירחמאל' had become corrupted

[1] Cp. *Crit. Bib.* p. 7.

into חברו אל. We will, however, consider it here because of the note, הוא ים המלח, which is supposed to imply the notion that the 'Salt Sea' at a later time extended itself over the vale of Siddim. There is, however, no parallel for such an expression as 'sea of salt.' The other names for the 'Dead Sea' are ים הערבה, Dt. iii. 17, etc., and הים הקדמוני, both of which describe the position of the Dead Sea, and it is presumable that ים המלח does so too. The name seems already to have puzzled the early Israelites (was not the 'Great Sea' itself a sea of salt?); hence we find ים המלח three times (*e.g.* Dt. iii. 17) in combination with the more intelligible phrase ים הערבה. That מלח in the former expression does *not* mean 'salt' is plain from the parallel phrases גי המלח (2 K. xiv. 7, etc.) and עיר המלח (Josh. xv. 62). That גי המ' is not the great marshy plain at the south end of the Dead Sea is plain; such ground can never have been chosen for a battlefield. In both phrases, and also in ים המ', מלח (like לחם in בית-לחם, and מלך in another place-name, *v.* 17)[1] is undoubtedly a popular transformation of ירחמאל. ים, too, is highly improbable as a paraphrase of עמק. As probably elsewhere (*e.g.* Isa. xxi. 1, title, and Job iii. 8, where יום comes from ים), it has sprung from ים', *i.e.* ימן (see on יון, x. 2), the short either for ירחמ' or for ישמ'. The name was apparently given to a special district; hence ירחמ' is added, which means the large Yeraḥme'elite region to which Yaman belongs.[2]

Now as to the עמק השדים, for which 𝔊 gives here (ἐπὶ) *τὴν φάραγγα τὴν ἁλυκήν*, and in *vv.* 8, 10, *ἡ κοιλὰς ἡ ἁλυκή*, *i.e.* ע' המלח. Theod., however (according to Jerome), gave *τῶν ἀλσῶν*, *i.e.* הָאֲשֵׁרִים, and 𝔊 may once have had the same reading (the Asherahs gave offence?). Renan, Wellh., and Winckl. point הַשֵּׁדִים, 'the demons.' But שדים only occurs twice in O.T. (Ps. cvi. 37, Dt. xxxii. 17), and both times it

[1] Winckler (*GI* ii. 93, 108) retains 'Salt Sea,' and connects the phrase with the widespread Oriental myth of sweet and bitter waters (cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Marah'). But this can hardly be made to account for גי המ' and עיר המ', nor for the many names on the modern map of Palestine compounded with *maliḥ*, *mālik*, and the like. And why does Winckler, so fond of emending elsewhere, suddenly hold his hand here?

[2] It will be observed that not only the so-called 'Salt Sea' but the 'bitumen pits' (*v.* 10) disappear when the text is closely examined.

is probably an error for אשרים (point אַשֻּׁרִים), *i.e.* either the local manifestations of the god Asshur[1] (see p. 23) or, as here, the Asshurites (cp. 2 S. ii. 9). This is the most essential correction. Possibly, too, עמק is miswritten for מעכת (so perhaps in Josh. vii. 24, xiii. 18, xv. 8, Judg. vii. 1, Isa. xvii. 5, Ps. lx. 8). There was a Maacath (see on 2 S. x. 6) not far from one of the districts which bore a name closely akin to אשחור, viz. בשור. Observe that in *v.* 17 (rev. text) עמק שחור is identified with עמק ירחמ׳, just as here ע׳ השדים is glossed by ימן ירחמ׳.

In *vv.* 5 *f.* we have a nest of problems which have hitherto not been adequately solved. The problems have to do with a series of ethnics and place-names. First comes רפאים. This people is said to dwell in 'Ashteroth-Ḳarnaim'—a name which does not occur again with the appended Ḳarnaim, but which is doubtless the Ashtaroth of Og, king of Bashan (Josh ix. 10, etc.), especially as we are told in Dt. iii. 13 that Bashan[2] and the connected region were called 'the land of Rephaim.' As to the Rephaim, we have no good reason to suppose that they were a primitive race which became extinct at the Israelitish conquest. Most probably רפאים should be grouped with ארפכשד and אפרים, at least so far as the first three letters are concerned (see on xli. 52). If so, it is really a modification of ערבים, 'Arabians.'[3] The chief city of the Rephaim is called Ashteroth-Ḳarnaim, *i.e.* apparently 'Ashtaroth of the two horns,' an enigmatical expression variously explained.[4] But קרנים here, as well as

[1] In Hos. xii. 12 שורים doubtless represents this same word אַשֻּׁרִים, not שָׁרִים. Again and again (see on xvi. 7) שור represents אשור.

[2] 'Bashan' most probably comes from Abshan, *i.e.* Arab-Yishman, 'Yishmanite (Ishmaelite) Arabia.' See on Ex. xxxi. 2, 6.

[3] May we identify these Rephaim with those of Sheól? Cp. Lagrange, *Rel. sém.* p. 273, 'On considère comme une punition de n'être pas couché avec les Rephaim; ce sont donc les morts en quelque sorte privilégiés. . . . Ce n'est qu'avec le temps qu'on a donné le nom de mânes à tous les morts.' This view accords with Ezek. xxxi. 18, xxxii. 19 *ff.*, Ps. lxxxix. 6 (rev. text), 11, cxliii. 3 (rev. text). But cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Dead'; 'Rephaim.'

[4] See Lagrange, *op. cit.* p. 126; also Macalister, Fourth Report on Gezer, *PEFQ*, July 1903, p. 227, and 'Ashtaroth' in Bible Dictionaries. On the reading of the MT. see Nestle, *Marginalien*, and G. F. Moore, *JBL*, 1898, pp. 155 *ff.*

in Am. vi. 13 (see *Crit. Bib. ad loc.*), is probably miswritten for ירקמן, *i.e.* ירחמאל; cp. ירקעם. As for עשתרות, surely we should read אַשְׁתֶּרֶת. אשתר occurs, though rarely, as equivalent to אַשְׁחֹר and אַשֻּׁר, as the name of a N. Arabian region. The feminine ending is often favoured in place-names. 'Ashtereth (Ashtart) of Yerahme'el' is closely parallel to 'Arab-'eshterah,' disguised in Josh. xxi. 27 as בעשתרה,[1] also to 'Ashtereth in Arab-Yerahme'el,' disguised as 'Asht. in Edrei' in Dt. i. 4 (see note). There were probably several Ashtereths (Ashtarts).

'The Zuzim in Ham'! זוזים no doubt = זמזמים *i.e.* ישמעאלים (see on Dt. ii. 20). A branch of the Ishmaelites is meant. הם, like המון[2] in xvii. 5 (see note), and חם in v. 32, 1 Chr. iv. 40, comes from some short popular form of ירחמאל. Some MSS. of Sam. read חם. Tg. Onk. and Jerus. read בחמתא; Olshausen, בְּחֻמָּת.—'The Emim in Shaveh Kiryathaim'! אימים, as in Dt. ii. 10 *f.*, represents אֵדֵמִים. Cp. on xxxvi. 24 (הימם). שוה קריתים comes from אשחור אשחרתים, two rival readings combined. See on *v.* 17, xxiii. 2, and note in xxv. 2 שוח from אשחור. Corruptions of Ashhur, like those of Yerahme'el, soon became independent of their origin.

In *v.* 6 חרי is hardly to be connected with the Eg. Ḫaru (Hommel, Gunkel, Meyer; see on xxxvi. 20, and *E. Bib.*, 'Horite'), but comes most probably from אַשְׁחֹרִי; שעיר from אשור = עשור. 'Asshur' and Ashhur are equivalent names; they sometimes have a broader, sometimes a narrower reference, and are variously corrupted. Cp. on xxxii. 4, xxxvi. 20, Dt. ii. 12 (the statement in this passage seems doubtful); and for Asshur, Ashhur, see on xvi. 7, 13 xxv. 18, 1 Chr. ii. 24, iv. 5. The home of the Ḥorites was בהררם שעיר. Buhl and Gunkel consider ש' to be a gloss. But this is not enough. רם must represent either אֶרֶם (see Num. xxiii. 7)[3] or אֶדֹם. The בהרי of Sam., 𝔊., Pesh. is

[1] Cp. on Ex. xxxi. 2.

[2] Cp. also המן (of Amalekite origin), Esth. iii. 1.

[3] קדם in Dt. *l.c.*, as usual, has come from ירחם = רקם (|| ארם). Winckler and Meyer (p. 243) have noticed that קדם often has a limited geographical reference, but do not explain how this came about (see *E. Bib.*, 'East, Sons of the').

conjectural.—איל פארן is hardly correct. Probably איל comes from אריאל or some similar form, and this from ירחמאל; cp. on אילמה, Ex. xv. 27. On פארן, see *E. Bib.*, 'Paran,' but note that פארן has probably the same origin as אפרים (xli. 52), and so means the Arabian mountain-land. Thus we get 'and the Horites in the mountains of Aram, as far as Yeraḥme'el-Paran ('Ebrōn).'

'Then they turned,' says the traditional text, 'and came to En-mishpat; that is, Kadesh' (*v.* 7). But En-mishpat, 'fountain of judgment,' is not more probable (in spite of the ingenious theorising of Meyer, p. 55) than Mêmerîbah, 'waters of controversy.' The similarity of meaning between the two phrases is undeniable; it even led Tg. ps.-Jon. to substitute מי מריבה here, as the better known name. The Targumist was also aware that 'Meribah' and 'Kadesh' were designations of the same place (cp. Num. xx. 1, 13), the full name of which (implying that there might be other Merîbahs) was Merîbath-Kadesh (Num. xxvii. 14). Still our experience with names like *'ēlōn mōreh* (xii. 6), *'ēlōn me'ōnenīm* (Judg. ix. 37), should inspire us with caution. As a thorough criticism shows, neither Merîbah nor Mishpat can be right. The former (see on Num. xx. 13) comes from מרימה, cp. מרמת, which is a distortion of ירחמאל (with fem. term.); the latter is a modification of צפת (cp. on שפט, 1 K. xix. 16).[1] עין should very possibly be עיר. Thus we get, for אל-עין משפט, אל-עיר צפת, 'to the city of Ṣephath'; Ṣephath is a shortened form of צרפת (see *E. Bib.*, 'Zarephath'). But clearly Ṣephath and Merîmah are not the same place; we may therefore suspect something wrong with הוא קדש, which is suitable for Merîmah, but hardly for Ṣephath, at least if קדש is here a place-name.

But was קדש really intended as a place-name? Is it not rather a corruptly written form of a longer regional name? May it not have the same origin as that which we shall have to assign to כשד (xxii. 22), or rather כשר, which has come from חשרם, *i.e.* אִשְׁחָר אֲרָם (see on xi. 28). Perhaps, indeed, we should do well, here at any rate, to notice הוא חשרם as the original form of the gloss. The gloss was most

[1] Initial מ as in משפתים, Gen. xlix. 14, Judg. v. 16; משרפות, Josh. xi. 8, xiii. 6 (see *Crit. Bib.*, and cp. *E. Bib.*, col. 2650, note 5).

probably misplaced; we shall see presently where it has most claim to be. Thus, I do not here decide the important question whether or no קדש, wherever it occurs, is an early corruption of חרשם, *i.e.* חשרם (= Ashḥur-Aram). It is worth noticing, however, that ברנע (MT. 'Barnea'), which is sometimes appended to קדש, is really a corruption either of ערבן (cp. above on פארן) or of רעמן, *i.e.* ירחמאל, and that רקם, which is given in Tg. Onk. and Jon. for קדש, is a well attested form of ירחם = ירחמאל; also that in xvi. 14 'Kadesh' is mentioned with 'Bered,' a name which may perhaps come from 'Bedad,' *i.e.* 'Arab-Dad' or 'Arab-Dedan,' again a district name. See, further, on Ex. xvii. 7, Num. xx. 13; also (for 'Kadesh-Barnea') on Num. xiii. 26 ('to the wilderness of Paran, to Kadesh').

The 'Amalekites' and the 'Amorites' are closely akin. At any rate עמלק, like [מלאכ[ים (2 S. xi. 1), is a corruption of ירחמאל, and אמרי probably comes by metathesis from ארמי (see on x. 16). Different branches of the same great people are meant. The Amorites (or Arammites) dwelt, we are told, in חצצן תמר. In 2 Chr. xx. 2 this place is plausibly identified with 'En-gedi' (see *E. Bib.*, *s.v.*), which, indeed, the Targums substitute for the text-reading.[1] The view, however, is not without serious difficulty. It implies that תמר here means 'palm-tree.' This is no doubt the general opinion. But no one has succeeded in so explaining חצ׳ as to suit תמר,[2] and elsewhere (see on xxxviii. 6) we have found that both as a place-name and as a personal name תמר is probably due to a popular metathesis of רמת, *i.e.* רָם (אֶרֶם) with the feminine ending, also (in Dt. xxxiv. 3, Judg. i. 16, iii. 13, 2 Chr. xxviii. 15) that תמרים[ה] עיר originally was עֲרַב רמתים.[3]

But we have still to find out the secret of חצצן. We

[1] Whether עֵין־גֶּדִי is the original form may be doubted. עֵין־גָּדִי might be thought of; the Gadites seem originally to have been settled in the south. Winckler (*KAT*, p. 225) takes ח׳ ח׳ as = עֵין גָּד, *i.e.* Paneas, but see on 'Baal-gad,' Josh. xi. 17. Or we might perhaps correct עֵרֶב גֶּדֶר.

[2] Delitzsch unplausibly sees in ח׳ a reference to an artificial mode of fertilising the female date-palms. The versions make no attempt at translation.

[3] Probably the תמר (רמת) of 1 K. ix. 18, Ezek. xlvii. 19, xlviii. 28 is meant.

expect the name of a district, and the duplication of צ justifies us in assuming that it is a compound name. צן is not a difficult word. It is a well-known N. Arabian name, and comes, through צען or צאן, from צבען, *i.e.* ישמעאל (see on xxxvi. 20, Num. xiii. 21). The initial letters חצ must represent חצר, *i.e.* אִשְׁחֶר (see on Josh. xi. 1, 1 K. ix. 15). We can now see where, most probably, the gloss הוא חשרם belongs. It is a perfectly correct note on חצ׳ תמר, which is not a place, but a district, and equivalent to חשרם.

Verse 8 was evidently expanded by the redactor, who also appears to have inserted *v.* 9, except the closing words, which have grown out of an earlier gloss, and will reward a thorough criticism. The traditional text gives ארבעה מלכים את־החמשה, 'four kings with the five.' But surely the traditional context requires, 'five kings with the four.' There is so much corruption in this narrative (see the very next verse) that we cannot help criticising the text of the gloss in the light of previous experience. We know (see on *v.* 17, xxiii. 2) that ארבע often comes from עֶרֶב and that מלך may represent ירחמאל. We may conclude that ארבעה מלכים has arisen, under the hand of the redactor, out of ערב ירחמ׳[ב], '(in) Arabia of Yerahme'el,' a suitable gloss on עמק השדים (מעכת חשרם). For the addition of את־החמשה the redactor is responsible. It will be remembered that in *v.* 3 there is another gloss on עמק השדים which is nearly equivalent to the present one.

The gloss 'in Arabia of Yerahme'el' most probably occurs again in *v.* 10. And amusing indeed is the disguise which בַּעֲרַב ירחמ׳ has this time assumed, viz. [ועמק הש׳] בארת בארת חמר '[and the plain (or vale) of Siddim] was pits, pits of bitumen.' How can any supposed grammatical parallel justify such a strange reading? If the plain of 'Siddim' were full of pits of bitumen, what general in his right mind would draw up his army there? It is clearly a very slight palliation to omit one בארת as a dittograph (cp. Judg. v. 22 *b*), and simply arbitrary to omit ב׳ חמר as a gloss, implying the 'later theory' that the scene of the events was the Dead Sea (Winckler). Beyond doubt, there is textual corruption, and the clue to its origin is furnished by חמר, which, like חמור in xxxiii. 19, etc., Judg. xv. 16, comes

from ירחם (Yarḥam = Yeraḥme'el). If so, בארת has plainly come from בערב (ע and א, ב and ת confounded.). Thus we get בערב ירחמ׳, which should join on to במעכת חשרם in *v.* 8; in short, the gloss has been given twice over. ועמק הש׳ (*v.* 10), or rather ומ׳ חשרם, resumes after the interruption in *v.* 9.—Afterwards read ומלך עמרה (Sam., 𝔊, Pesh.), perhaps a later insertion.—After שמה insert perhaps רבים, and in *v.* 11 omit perhaps עמרה.

The way in which Abram is reintroduced is certainly strange, but not stranger than the name Abram itself,[1] which marks him out as a kinsman of the defeated chieftains, not to say of the kings on both sides (see on *v.* 3). By the novel appendage העברי, which Sievers on supposed metrical grounds omits, he is represented as a nomad who has migrated into a land with a settled population, and who has himself taken a step forward in civilisation. According to Zimmern and Winckler, 'Hebrews' are mentioned in the Amarna letters as Ḫabiri. Not that the Ḫabiri, whose incursions are dreaded by the Canaanite princes of the time, are the tribes which afterwards appear as Israelites; but they are at least predecessors, and of the same race as Israel (cp. the Goths and the Franks). The term, as Winckler points out, indicates a distinction not only of race, but of culture.[2] Whether this identification can be sustained or not is still doubtful,[3] but the analogy between the *Ḫabiri* and the *'Ibriyyîm* can hardly be denied. The origin of the former is obscure, whereas עברי appears to be a race-name produced by metathesis (see on עבר, x. 21) from ערבי (Arabian), but in later times not recognised as such, and specially applied in the way mentioned above.

Assuming that the reader does not know it already, the narrator now states where 'Abram the Hebrew' dwelt. It was 'by the sacred tree(s) of Mamre' (xiii. 18), and to 'Mamre' is added the qualification 'the Amorite' (or 'Arammite'), which must be taken in connexion with *v.* 7,

[1] Abram, as we have seen (on xi. 26), means 'Arabia of Aram' (= Yeraḥme'el).

[2] See Winckler, *GI*, i. 16; *Kohut Memorial Volume*, p. 609; *KAT*[3], p. 198; *Abraham als Babylonier*, p. 34.

[3] See Stade, *Akad. Reden* (1899), pp. 120 *f.*

where 'the Amorites' (or 'Arammites') are spoken of as having suffered in the recent raid. A further appendage mentions two persons of whom Mamre was the 'brother,' and adds (as is commonly supposed) that they were the 'confederates,' or perhaps 'patrons,'[1] of Abram. In *v.* 24 these three are mentioned again as 'the men who went with me' (cp. on *v.* 14). We must, *it would seem*, suppose that both Mamre and Eshkol, together with the otherwise unknown Aner, are 'heroes eponymi,' the names being drawn from places. But what a series of difficulties the common view presents! First, the 'heroes eponymi' here and here only. Next, the inconsistency between *v.* 14 and *v.* 24 as to those who constituted Abram's warlike force. Next, the strange repetition of אחי in *v.* 13. And lastly, the difficult phrase בעלי ברית אב׳ in *v.* 13. The textual difficulties must be treated first. (*a*) There is a similar and equally strange repetition of a word indicating relationship in xi. 29, and both passages have to be explained on the same principle. That is, just as אבי in that passage represents עֶרֶב, so אֲחִי (see on x. 21) in our passage represents אַשְׁחוּר. We can now give Mamre, Eshkol, and Aner their proper significance as place-names. Ashḥur-eshkol and Ashḥur-aner are alternative geographical glosses on Mamre. Winckler's theory that the three names are derived from the cultus of Baal-berith at Shechem is forced. (*b*) Dogmatism on textual criticism is justified when an extensive experience of corrupt passages lies behind it. Let me, then, point out that it is next door to certain that ברית אברם has come from קרית עַרְבִים,[2] by which phrase is meant the city called in xxiii. 2 קרית ארבע, or rather ק׳ עֶרֶב (see note), which is equivalent, as the same passage states, to Ḥebron.

Thus the closing words of *v.* 13 are a comparatively late gloss (presupposing the conversion of Mamre, Eshkol, and Aner into individuals), which states that the three persons spoken of were 'lords' or 'citizens' of the city near which Abram dwelt. ממרא, as we have seen (on xiii. 18), probably comes from ראמן, one of the forms of ירחמאל. So also,

[1] So Kraetzschmar, *Bundesvorstellung*, p. 24.

[2] I need not here consider whether קרית may not have come from רחבות or rather אשחרת.

probably, does ענר in the gloss which follows (Sam. actually has ענרם), א having given place to ע.[1] אשכל, which Hommel (*Gr.* pp. 101, 184) explains as 'Fire is the protective god,' most probably comes from אַשֻּׁר מלך, *i.e.* 'Asshur-Yeraḥme'el.'[2] Cp. on Num. xiii. 23, and note that in Ezra viii. 18 אשכל is the name which underlies the mysterious איש שכל (A.V. 'a man of understanding,' but R.V. mg. 'Ish-sechel').

And now Abram's prompt action (*v.* 14). We expect a plain prose description, but instead we get the combination of obscurities—וירק את־חניכיו, 'he emptied (or unsheathed) his initiated ones.' Sam.'s וַיַּדֵּק, 'he looked closely at,' and Winckler's וַיֵּדֵק (from an unknown verb דקה = Ass. *diḳu*),[3] 'he set in motion,' are neither of them satisfactory. 𝔊's ἠρίθμησε is a mere paraphrase of וַיַּדֵּק. The easiest and most suitable correction is ויקרא. חניכיו (ἅπ. λεγ.) is equally suspicious. 'Initiated' into what?[4] Into warlike exercises? Into habits of obedience? Into the rites of the family cultus (Holz.)? Nor can one feel sure about ילידי ביתו, *apparently* a gloss on חניכיו. In xvii. 12, 23, Num. xiii. 22 (Josh. xv. 14), 2 S. xxi. 16, 18, Jer. ii. 14, יליד has probably come from ירחמאל = יריל (see on Ex. xii. 42); cp. also on הילדים, xxxiii. 14. ילידי ביתו in xvii. 23 (see note) represents בית ירח', and י' ב' here appears to have the same origin. And now, what as to חניכיו? Must it not have come from הענקים (Dt. ii. 10, etc.), to which בית ירחמאל was originally appended as a gloss, just as in Josh. xv. 14, as a gloss on 'the three sons of Anak,' we find ילידי הענק, *i.e.* ירחמאל הענק. The 'Anakim' were, in fact, at once Yeraḥme'elites and Arabians. It was fitting, therefore, that they should be repeatedly described as Yeraḥme'elites[5] and their chief city as Ḳiryath- (or Ashḥoreth-) ʿarâb. Abram's first step, therefore, was to summon the Anakim who dwelt in the neighbouring city to accompany him against the foe.

[1] In 1 Chr. vi. 55 ענר stands, as a place-name, beside בלעם (an expansion of בלע; see on *v.* 2). For less probable views see *E. Bib.*, 'Aner.'

[2] אש for אַשֻּׁר as שם for ישמעאל, etc. Cp. אשדוד from אש' דוד (הדד = דוד).

[3] *AOF* i. 102, note 2; so Gunkel.

[4] Winckler actually sees a play upon חֲנֻכָּה and חָנוֹךְ (*AOF* xxi. 407).

[5] יליד = ירחמאל. In chap. xxiii. (P) the Ḥebronites are designated בני חת. But there is no real inconsistency (see notes).

The number of the warriors amounted in all to exactly 318. It is surely too large to refer to home-born slaves; it is also too small to be that of a force brought against a successful army of invaders.[1] Hitzig found an explanation of it in Gematria (the value in cypher of אליעזר), Winckler (*GI* ii. 26 *f.*) in astronomy (318, the number of the days during which the moon is visible).[2] Experience of textual corruptions, however, suggests a better explanation. Often and often numerals have sprung up out of corruptions of ethnics (see on xxiii. 2). Such appears to be the case here. Underneath שמנה עשר ושלש מאות, in accordance with parallels, we have to read [ישמעאל ארם] ישמעאל אֲשֶׁר. Evidently it is a twofold gloss, and most probably it refers to דמשק (see on *v.* 15); *i.e.* it is misplaced.

For a closely parallel case, one may perhaps venture to refer to the famous passage about the 'number of the beast' (Rev. xiii. 18). Here, too, the right key seems to have been missed. We are told, indeed, that 'the number of the beast' is 'the number of a man.' This, however, is doubtless due to misunderstanding. Almost certainly the original text had אנוש, and this (as frequently in O.T.) came from ישמעאל.[3] The truth seems to be that *ἄριθμος γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν* is a gloss on *τὸν ἄρ. τοῦ θηρίου.* The number itself (666) supplants אשור ישמ', 'Asshur-Ishmael,' the fuller name (as we have seen) of the region commonly called ירחמאל or ישמעאל.[4] That the later transmitters of the traditional 'number' understood the statement, is, of course, not to be supposed.

And what success had the Hebrew general? Two

[1] Jeremias (*ATAO*, p. 215) finds 'no cause for doubt,' and thinks 'the forces on both sides will not have been enormous.' But the king of Elam was surely much mightier than any 'Hebrew.'

[2] Gunkel and Baentsch incline to follow Winckler, but the former remarks that there are no other possible traces of a moon-myth in the chapter. König rejects Winckler's view, but speaks a word for the Gematria theory, which, however, is not confirmed by Biblical evidence elsewhere. See his *Im Kampfe um das A.T.* iv. 47 *f.*

[3] Proved, I hope, for the *συνετοί*, by xxi. 17, *μέτρον ἀνθρώπου, ὅ ἐστιν ἀγγέλου, i.e.* הוא ירחמאל. אנוש comes from ישמ' through שמאן (cp. שמעון). For מלאך = ירחמ', see on xvi. 7.

[4] *ἑξακόσιοι* = מאות *שש* = (ירח') אשור ישמעאל; *ἑξήκοντα ἕξ* = *שש* *ששים* = ישמ' אשור, an inverse dittograph

variants refer to this subject. First, 'he pursued (them) as far as Dan' (*v.* 14), and next, 'he pursued them as far as Ḥobah, which is on the left of דמשק' (*v.* 15). In Am. Tab. 139, 63, Damascus is described as 'in the land of Ubi.'[1] We have seen, however, that the scene of our story is in the N. Arabian border-land. Probably, therefore, חובה should be רְחֹבָה; and since the narrative in Judg. xviii. also relates to this region, it is in point to mention that, according to *vv.* 28 *f.*, Dan and Beth-rehob were not far apart. May not חובה be the same as בית-רחוב? דמשק here, as often (cp. on xv. 2, and on משך, x. 2), should be traced back to רמשך or רמשח, *i.e.* אֲרַם אַשְׁחֵר. Perhaps the reader should here be warned that names which have the same origin are not thereby shown to belong to the same place. נשדים, for instance, has the same origin as דמשק, but the two names do not *necessarily* denote the same place (see on קדש, *v.* 7). Ramshak or Ramshaḥ was evidently an important place and region near the border of the territory in N. Arabia claimed by the Israelites (cp. *Crit. Bib.* on 1 K. xi. 24); it belonged to the king of the southern Aram. Until we see this the much-disputed passage 1 K. xix. 15 is a hopeless riddle (see *Crit. Bib.*).

We are also told—but how can I possibly render וַיֶּחָלֵק עליהם לילה? How can 'he divided himself against them' be right? A manœuvre like that of Gideon would have been otherwise described (see Judg. vii. 16). Winckler formerly (he now gives a new mythological theory) proposed to point וְיִחַלֵּק, explaining the verb as a denom. from Ass. *ḥulluḳu*, 'fugitive.' But surely the word is corrupt (Gunkel), and we must read וילחם, 'and he attacked (them).' עבדיו should probably be והערבים, 'and the Arabians,' *i.e.* the men of Ḳiryath-arbim (*v.* 13 *b*). Of course, the statement as to the pursuit of the foe is in its right place in *v.* 15, not in *v.* 14.

In *v.* 17 we note the same redactional insertion about 'the kings' as in *v.* 5. The scene of the meeting of Abram and the king of 'Sodom' (see on *v.* 2) is called in the text עמק שוה, for which Hommel (*AHT*, p. 151, note 1) and Winckler (*GI* ii. 28) would read עמק שרה (?), explaining by

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Hobah.'

Ass. *sharru* = Heb. *melek*. Thus the gloss, ע׳ המלך, is apparently accounted for. But with שוה in *v.* 5 before us, which certainly comes from אשחור, and with so many other mutilated and corrupt names in this narrative, we may prefer to read מעכת אשחור (cp. on עמק, *v.* 3). This seems to be identified in a gloss with Maakath-Yerahme'el (cp. on 'the king's vale,' 2 S. xviii. 18). Most critics think that the mention of 'the vale of Shaveh, that is, the king's vale' in *v.* 17 prepares the way for the meeting of the two high powers in *v.* 18. But is 'Salem' the short for 'Jerusalem,' and was there a עמק המלך near that city? See the next note, and *Crit. Bib.* on 2 S. xviii. 18.

We are now coming to even greater problems. As the passage, *vv.* 18-20, stands, it looks at first sight very much like a later insertion.[1] And yet the form of Abram's oath in *v.* 22 clearly presupposes the declaration (by whomsoever made) in *vv.* 19 *f.*, to say nothing of the point of contact which has been found between the close of *v.* 17 and the beginning of *v.* 18. We are therefore specially entitled to apply criticism to the text.

There is, of course, no doubt at all that some one is referred to in *vv.* 18-20 who was a priest of El-'elyōn (if this reading is correct), but who was he? He was not a king of any of the three Salems (Shalems) which have been suggested north of Jerusalem, for none of them had a special reputation for sanctity. Jerusalem, however, would do excellently for the city of this great priest, and in post-exilic times it would be important to find such an early attestation of its sacredness. But why should 'Jerusalem' be called here 'Salem'? the form Urusalim (= Jerusalem) goes back as far as to the Amarna tablets; and though another Biblical passage (Ps. lxxvi. 3) is usually quoted in behalf of Salem as = Jerusalem, the presence of textual corruption in that passage (admittedly a late one) can hardly be denied. Winckler therefore has a claim to be heard (1902) when he proposes[2] to take מלך שלם as a variant for מלכי־צדק, שלם

[1] Whence the sudden appearance of Melchizedek? and out of what does Abram give tithes? Cp. *Oxf. Hex.* ii. 21.

[2] *KAT*,(3) p. 224. In *AOF*, *l.c.*, however, he makes Shalem the earlier name of Shechem.

being (as he holds) a divine name synonymous with צדק. But his presuppositions on the formation of names are incorrect, and the old Babylonian name Sa-lim-aḫu, which he adduces, has most probably come from Ishmael-Ashḥur. By a curious coincidence this very same compound name underlies one of the chief corrupt phrases in *v.* 18. The reader will see what is meant presently. Just now the point to emphasise is that the two elements in מלך שלם are synonymous, מ׳ representing ירחמאל (see on *v.* 17, end) and שלם being a popular distortion of ישמעאל (see on xxxiii. 18, and on לשם, Josh. xix. 47). Ab-shalom is precisely analogous; see 2 S. xvii. 26, where ואבשלום comes from בערב ישמעאל.[1]

And now as to Malki-ṣedeḳ. How strange this sudden introduction of this priestly visitor is! We have seen that he was not 'king of Salem,' but was he really named Malki-ṣedeḳ? The name is a very possible one; צדקמלך occurs on a Phœnician coin (Cooke, p. 349), and we have אדני־צדק in Josh. x. 1, 3.[2] What it would mean is a matter for discussion. The explanation 'the king (or, my king) is righteousness' is less in favour now than one suggested by the discovery of many hitherto unknown deities, among whom we may very possibly include Ṣedeḳ.[3] The true meaning of Malki-ṣedeḳ would thus be (so it is held) 'Ṣidḳ is king' or 'Ṣidḳ is Milk.' This, however, seems to be a mistake. The Phœnician name Ṣidḳi-milk is probably a N. Arabian name carried northwards by immigrants. צדק is an old clan-name,[4] and מלך, as so often, represents 'Yeraḥme'el.'

So much as to the meaning of Malki-ṣedeḳ, if the name is genuine. But *is* it genuine, either here or in Ps. cx. 4 *b*

[1] It is true the personal name אבשלום also comes ultimately from ערב ישמ׳. But the point here is that just as אבש׳ in 2 S. *l.c.* seems to be a personal name, but is not, and really designates an Ishmaelite region, so מלכיצ׳ in Genesis is not really a personal name, but designates a Yeraḥme'elite and Asshurite region.

[2] See *Crit. Bib.*, *ad loc.*, and also on Judg. i. 5; the form Adoni-bezek in Joshua is not impossible. Neither bezeḳ nor ṣedeḳ *need* be a divine name. Ṣedeḳ, at any rate, became a widely spread clan-name. See *E. Bib.*, 'Zadok,' 'Zedekiah.'

[3] Note *συδυκ* in the Phœnician cosmogony (Philo Bybl.), and see Zimmern, *KAT*[3], pp. 473 *f.*; cp. also on צין, x. 15.

[4] See *Crit. Bib.* on 2 S. viii. 17.

(see *E. Bib.*, 'Melchizedek'), the only other O.T. passage in which the name is given in the traditional text? The question is a difficult one. But Gen. xiv. contains so many glosses that we could not be surprised if this name were one, and it certainly appears as if, to obtain an intelligible view of the meaning of the episode in *vv.* 17 *ff.*, we cannot help assuming *v.* 18 *a* to be a collection of glosses. Hence ומלכי־צדק probably represents either הוא ירחמאל צדק, or—if we consider צדק to be quite out of place—הוא יר' יצחק, where יצחק may be taken as a popular distortion[1] of אִשְׁחֶר. This will be a second gloss on עמק שוה in *v.* 17, parallel to עמק המלך. It should be added that מלך שלם, *i.e.* ירח' ישמ' (see above), is probably a twofold gloss on יצדק (*i.e.* יצחק); also that Sievers, too, holds 'Malki-ṣedeḳ' to be intrusive, but supposes that a glossator, out of his own head, devised this as a name for the 'king of Salem' (*Metr. Stud.* p. 273).

Having mentioned Sievers, it is natural to remark here that he omits not only 'Malki-ṣedeḳ,' but also the statement that 'he was a priest of El-ʿelyōn' (as a gloss), with the result that the offering of tithes is made by the king of Salem to Abram, not by Abram to the priest-king of Salem. He also inserts the words (in *v.* 20, end), 'and Abram said to him,' the true sequel of which is to be found in *vv.* 22 *f.*, while *v.* 24 is the sober, prosaic answer of Abram to the equally sober, prosaic offer of the king of Sodom, contained in *v.* 21. But surely the omission of והוא כהן וגו' as a gloss is unreasonable; the very solemn benediction in *vv.* 19 *f.* required some such explanation as the priestly character of the speaker supplies. Nor is the idea that a Canaanitish king gave 'tithes of all' to Abram, thus acknowledging his political supremacy, at all plausible. Sievers' fresh investigation, however, brings into clearer light the difficulties and improbabilities of the traditional text.

The highly improbable words הוציא לחם ויין (for which Dt. xxiii. 4 gives no parallel) are retained by Sievers, and explained by Jeremias[2] as indicating a sacred meal. No

[1] See on יצחק, xvii. 17; and note the use of the equivalent form ישחק for Ashḥur in Am. ix. 16 (|| 'Israel,' *i.e.* probably the territory of Israel in the southern border-land).

[2] *Babylonisches im N.T.* p. 77.

good reason can be offered either from a metrical or from an archæological point of view. I venture to think that those who have read the O.T. with our present presuppositions must at once see, at any rate, how לחם ויין is best accounted for. They seem to represent an early gloss. For we cannot deny that לחם may be = ירחמאל (cp. on מלח, *v.* 3), and ויין may be = יָמָן or יָמָן (see on יין, xlix. 12 ; היין, Hab. ii. 5). This thoroughly suits the context. The scribe evidently took הוא to be the short for הוציא. The sense of *vv.* 17 *f.* now becomes clear (omitting the glosses, and reserving El-ʿelyōn),—'And the king of Ḥasram went out to meet him, after his return from defeating Birdad-armal, to Maakath-Ashḥur ; now he was a priest of El-ʿelyōn.' The parallel of Yithro, another priest and prince of N. Arabia, will occur to every one. That the letters of Abd-ḫiba, prince of Urusalim (under Amenhotep IV. of Egypt), are in any way illustrative of Malki-ṣedeḳ does not appear to have been made out. Nor does Urusalim mean 'city of (the god) Salim,' but 'city of Ishmael.'[1]

The exact meaning of El-ʿelyōn remains to be decided. That this divine name was specially common among the Jews in post-exilic times, is admitted.[2] In the context of our passage (*vv.* 19 *f.*, 22) it is said to have been used both by the great ancestor of Israel and by a neighbouring king presumably of another race. In Num. xxiv. 16 it is put into the mouth of a great non-Israelitish diviner called Bilʿam. The question arises whether it may not originally have been a non-Israelitish name of God. This view is confirmed by the fact that Philo of Byblus attests Ἐλιοῦν as a Phœnician name for God,[3] and also fits in with results at which we have arrived as to the type of religion prevalent among the N. Arabian kinsmen of the Israelites, and adopted from them with modifications by the Israelites. At the same time, it is very possible that עליון was not the original

[1] That 'Ishmael' took many forms, is certain. See, however, A. Jeremias, *ATAO*, p. 217.

[2] See further Kautzsch, *E. Bib.*, 'Names,' § 118 ; Charles, *Enoch*, p. 284 ; Cheyne, *Origin of Psalter*, pp. 26 *f.*, 51, 83 *f.*, 314.

[3] *Fragm. Historicorum Græcorum*, iii. 567 (Ἐλιοῦν καλούμενος Ὕψιστος.

form of the name in our passage. (1) The parallel divine names compounded with אל in the Pentateuch, such as אל עולם, אל שדי, אל בית־אל, אל ישרון, when critically examined, all turn out (see notes) to be names connecting God with the N. Arabian people. And (2) in two passages in the Psalter which appear to contain עליון as a divine name, the reading is incorrect,[1] and should be עולם (Ps. vii. 18, ix. 3). It seems not improbable, therefore, that, whether through the intermediate form עולם or not, עליון, as a name of God, at any rate in our passage, has come from some form of ירחמאל or ישמעאל. Parallels may be found in עלון (Chr. עלין) in xxxvi. 23, and the very singular אליועיני (1 Chr. iii. 23, etc.) or אליעיני (1 Chr. viii. 20), which (see the occurrences, *E. Bib.*) evidently represent some N. Arabian ethnic name. The chief divine name in N. Arabia was (to judge from the O.T.) Yeraḥmeel or Ishmael, and the race of his worshippers took his name for their own. That he was honoured as the maker of heaven and earth, we have seen already (see on chap. i.). The gloss 'Yahweh' in *v.* 22 is not incorrect, for 'Yahweh' grew out of 'Yeraḥme'el' in the manner and in the sense already described.

It is impossible to solve with absolute certitude the riddle of the words ויתן לו מעשר מכל. The easiest supposition is that the troublesome little clause is a late gloss inserted by some one who took שלם to mean Jerusalem, and wished to honour the holy city, but did not see what exegetical difficulties he was creating.[2] Unfortunately conjectures like these generally have to give way to more solidly based theories, and this may be the case here. Considering that in *vv.* 22, 23, there are probably two glosses on the divine name El-ʿelyōn, one יהוה, the other (an earlier one) Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el (see below), we naturally

[1] See Cheyne, *Ps.*(2) i. 22, Briggs's treatment (1906) of the two psalm-passages ignores the difficulties; consequently he makes no attempt to recover the true text.

[2] See Dillmann's note. Sievers (*Metr. St.* p. 273), who has already expunged the name Melchizedek, and bidden us be content with a nameless secular king of Shalem, makes 'Abram' the subject of the verb 'he gave.' Erbt (*Die Hebr.* p. 66) only changes the name of Melchizedek's residence. But he also makes the priest of El-ʿelyōn give the tenth of all (of all what?) to Abram.

expect to find at any rate one gloss on the same name on this its first appearance. To the question, Who is El-ʿelyōn? —the words ויתן וגו׳ may be expected to give an answer. What answer? A twofold one. עשר מכל represents אשר ירחמאל, *i.e.* Asshur-Yeraḥme'el—one of the fuller names of the N. Arabian God; מכל represents ירחמאל, precisely as do מלך and למך, also מיכל (1 S. xviii. 20) and מלאך (xvi. 7). There remains ויתן לו מ. It is possible (and here probable) that this was produced by the redactor out of הוא יתמאל; לומ, *i.e.* מול, comes from מאל or מעאל (fragments of ירחמ׳, ישמ׳; cp. on מול, Dt. i. 1, and on אתמול, Dt. ii. 34, Isa. xxx. 28). The prefixed ו, as often, represents הוא, 'that is.' Thus we get the gloss, 'that is, Ithmael (Ishmael); Asshur-Yeraḥme'el.' Ishmael and Yeraḥmeel (= Asshur-Yeraḥmeel) are, in fact, both names of the great compound N. Arabian deity.

On *v.* 22, Gunkel remarks that Abram intentionally repeats 'El-elyōn, possessor (?) of heaven and earth,' that it may be clear that he and Malki-ṣedeḳ have the same God. It would be more accurate to say that Abram wishes to profess solemnly his recognition of the God of Ḥashram (Sodom) as his own God. Such was doubtless the view originally presupposed in these narratives (see on chap. i.). But for the purpose of such a profession it is enough that Abram, in framing his oath, makes mention of El-ʿelyōn (= El-Yeraḥme'el; see above); קנה שמים וארץ is probably (as Sievers takes it) an interpolation from *v.* 19. Certainly יהוה is intrusive (as Gunkel and Sievers also see); why should Abram insist on a minor point of difference between himself and the king? For a minor difference it would certainly be in those early times. One writes thus from the point of view of later religion. When the narrative arose, יהוה was really only an expansion of ירחמאל—not the יהוה of the greater prophets or of the later redactors. Note that 𝔊 and Pesh. do not recognise יהוה; Sam. has האלהים.

But nothing anywhere can beat the singularity of the corruption in *v.* 23, 'from a thread even to a sandal-thong.' What a bathos! Another almost equally impossible phrase occurs in Am. ii. 6, 'because they sold . . . the poor for a pair of shoes' (נעלים). Shall we ask Winckler for an

'Oriental' explanation? He is quite ready, and will also show us how אכלו (*v.* 24) can mean 'have stolen.' Or shall we apply a keener criticism, and recognise that אם מחוט ועד should be אם־אחטא עליך, 'surely I will not sin against thee.' The meaning is that if Abram had accepted the offer of the property of 'Sodom,' and so left the inhabitants of the city impoverished, it would be a sin against them and their king which Abram refuses to commit. שרוך־נעל can also be accounted for. It is a misplaced gloss on אל עליון, *i.e.* it represents the fuller name of the N. Arabian God, like the parallel gloss at the end of *v.* 20. שרוך is a corruption of אשחור; cp. שורק, Judg. xvi. 4, and see on שכר, xv. 1. Similarly, נעל, like נעלים in the Amos parallel quoted above, comes from ירחמאל.

In *v.* 24 it is impossible to tolerate בלעדי, the only legitimate meaning of which is 'without me,' or 'apart from me.' As in the parallel case of xli. 16, it comes from some corrupt form of ירחמאל, probably ירבעל. 'Yeraḥme'el' was, of course, a gloss on some preceding difficult word, perhaps on עליון.—That 'Aner, Eshkol, and Mamre' is an incorrect gloss (from *v.* 13) is pointed out by Winckler and Sievers. Cp. on *v.* 14.

Looking back on this narrative in its corrected form we are still struck by its singularity. We have not, indeed, to trouble ourselves about supposed points of contact with Babylonian history, but we should like greater clearness than seems to be attainable respecting the two branches of the Yeraḥme'elite race between which hostilities are said to have broken out. That Abram should have joined the fray would not be strange, but for the ideality with which the other traditions of this patriarch are suffused. For how could he, as a Yeraḥme'elite, though of another clan, have kept aloof altogether? What reason had he to fear, being under the divine protection? We know already that Hebrew narrators of the type of J and E did not mind sometimes leaving archaic elements which they could not venture to excise or to transform. This seems to be the case here. The narrator wished to glorify Abram and his God; he also wished to emphasise the essential religious unity between Abram and the Yeraḥme'elite kinsmen whom

he befriended (cp. pp. 36 *ff.*). His material he derived from tradition; the setting of it is all his own. That later editors were not completely satisfied with his work, is not surprising. And, of course, errors of the scribes, as well as a growing haziness respecting the early races, contributed to the sad results which have caused so much perplexity (note *e.g.* the number 318 in *v.* 14) to modern critics.

DIVINE ENCOURAGEMENT TO ABRAM (GEN. XV.)

TWO connected theophanies with promises attached, the one of present deliverance, the other of future possession of the land which Abram is entering (cp. xii. 7). Religiously viewed, the narrative shows less *naïveté* than those in which God shows himself in a bodily form. From a literary point of view, it is obscure, and suffers from some striking inconsistencies. To these we must now direct our attention. The events of the first part (for the principal transition is from *v.* 6 to *v.* 7) are supposed to take place by night; those of the second, at first by day, and afterwards by night. And yet there is no notice of the dawning of a second day. The two parts also appear to have no inner connexion; *v.* 6, as the narrative stands, is psychologically improbable. From the same point of view the afflicting statement of the long servitude of the Israelites (*v.* 13) is incomprehensible; would it not have robbed the concluding promise of much of its value? One may add that the second part is greatly deficient in consecutiveness. Next, as to the colouring of the narrative. The introduction, as the text stands, is singularly pale. There is nothing at all concrete about the opening theophany, nor is it mentioned

where it took place. Moreover, those who interpret the phrase *nehar Miṣr[a]im*[1] in *v.* 18 as meaning the Nile must be struck by the unusual south-west boundary given to Canaan. Then as to the forms of representation. The description of Abram as the recipient of a prophetic revelation, the profound conception of faith in *v.* 6, and the reference to a covenant or guarantee (*berîth*) of Yahweh, are not in accordance with the earlier tradition.[2] The difficulties of the name 'Eliezer-Damascus'[3] and of the four hundred years of bondage are also severe trials to the interpreter.

Altogether, criticism has seldom had a harder task than to account for the origin and growth of this strange narrative. Like his predecessors, the present writer has in former days confronted this problem. But one important preliminary both he and his colleagues had pardonably neglected, viz. that keener criticism which depends on the study of recurrent types of corruption, and which is restrained from undue subjectivity by the N. Arabian theory rendered possible by Winckler. This omission the writer now desires to repair.

The result to which his textual researches point is that the narrative, even in its original form, is comparatively late. The primitive elements which undoubtedly exist cannot neutralise those which are quite as clearly non-primitive. The current literary analysis,[4] in spite of its imperfectly critical textual basis, sufficiently justifies us in assigning the narrative to a member of the so-called Yahwistic school.

The original writing of the Yahwist (J) must have been supplemented at an early date by a redactor, who apparently viewed it as an appendix to chap. xiv. This view of the redactor is of course psychologically impossible. The

[1] If we point נהר מִצְרַיִם, we must agree with Driver that this can only mean 'the Nile, or at least the easternmost (Pelusiac) arm of it.' The true pointing, however, seems to be מִצְרָיִם.

[2] See Staerk, *Studien zur Religions- und Sprachgeschichte*, pp. 43 *ff.*

[3] Dillm. supposes that Eliezer had some connexion with Damascus, so that if he became Abram's heir the property would ultimately go to that city. Most improbable, as Driver also sees.

[4] See especially B. W. Bacon, *Hebraica*, Oct. 1890, and cp. his *The Genesis of Genesis* (1892), pp. 124-126, besides the more recent works of Holzinger and Gunkel.

victory which, according to chap. xiv., Abram had gained could not have put him in the state in which he appears in chap. xv., a state, not of high self-consciousness, but of depression and anxiety. This anxiety can be easily accounted for by referring to the parallel case of Isaac in xxvi. 24. It is plain that the patriarch had just crossed the border into a new country. Now, too, we can see the significance of the divine title in *v.* 2, which, in the original writing, was very possibly, not אדני יהוה, but ארמון יהוה (see p. 34). 'Armon' or 'Yerahme'el' was, in fact, that member of the divine duad (or triad) who took the closest interest in human affairs. It follows from this view that, as Kraetzschmar has pointed out, the original position of the narrative was most probably after xii. 7*a* (J).

It appears that the text had already become somewhat corrupt when the redactor received it. He was, however, still able to recognise and to understand the references of the original writing to the N. Arabians. That writing he expanded, but did not, except in *v.* 1, alter. The original work seems to be comprised within *vv.* 1-3, 9-11, 17-18. Textual criticism must be called in to restore it to its original form, as well as to correct the textual errors which have crept into the redactor's additions.

Let us now consider the textual difficulties of *vv.* 1-3. (*a*) הָיָה דְבַר יׄ אֶל (*v.* 1 ; cp. *v.* 4), of prophetic revelation, nowhere else in Genesis. (*b*) בַּמַּחֲזֶה. Not in J's manner. Besides, if a vision were referred to, מראה would be the natural word (xlvi. 2, E). מחזה only once again in Pent., viz. in Num. xxiv. 4, 16, where it is a corruption of ירחמאל. (*c*) The two parts of the divine speech do not cohere well. That Abram should be exhorted not to be afraid, and should be assured that his God would shield him, is conceivable, but it is not natural that the Speaker should at once turn aside to tell Abram that his reward (for what?) should be very large. (*d*) 'What wilt thou give me, seeing that I go (hence) childless' (*v.* 2), would not be a natural speech for Abram, even if the words objected to in *v.* 1*b* were correct. The common-sense view surely is that whoever made Abram say 'what wilt thou give me?' was thinking of what is said in *v.* 18 (Bacon, *Hebraica*, 1890,

p. 76). This may well make us suspect corruption of the text of *v.* 2 *a.* (*e*) *V.* 2 *b* has been explained most variously; can we say that it has yet been explained at all? (*f*) The expression בן ביתי (*v.* 3) for the son of a Hebrew slave by a foreign bondmaid (Bertholet, *Stellung*, pp. 55 *f.*) occurs nowhere else, and the seemingly parallel phrase ילידי ביתו (xiv. 14) is corrupt. (*g*) ירש with the accusative, in the sense of 'to be some one's heir' (*v.* 4), is unusual; Hos. ix. 6 is a precarious parallel.

It is hoped that textual criticism has not, even here, been altogether baffled. The key to the situation seems to lie in שכרך (*v.* 1, end), the accuracy of which, in the interests of a natural exegesis, we are bound to question. In 1 Chr. xxvi. 4 the personal name שכר, and in Ps. lxxii. 10 אשכר, certainly represent an ancient district-name, on which see the discussion of the tribe-name יששכר (xxx. 18). הרבה and מאד have probably come from ירחם (ירחמאל) and ארם respectively. We should therefore read, for שכרך הרבה מאד, באשכר ירחמ׳ (ארם a variant). An alternative reading is בירחמאל, underlying במחזה. The fuller phrase, however, is to be preferred. I conjecture that from אחר to דבר־יהוה (*v.* 1) is a redactor's substitute for וירא יהוה (see xii. 7). Having shifted the position of the passage, and introduced prophetic announcements, he thought the substituted words more suitable. He kept, however, אל־אברם באש׳ ירחמ׳. Of course, the arbitrary transpositions made by the redactor arose out of exegetical necessities.

The last clause of the divine speech still has to be restored. It is represented in MT. (𝔊) by ואנכי הולך ערירי. Now ערי is one of the corruptions of ערב (xiii. 12), and ערירי, at any rate, may have come from ערבי׳ = ערבים. הולך, too, is corrupt. It may be illustrated by חילי, Hab. iii. 19, which clearly ought to be גאלי. Read, therefore, גֹּאֵלְךָ [מֵ]ערבים (see on *vv.* 7-18). And this enables us to explain the enigmatical words of *v.* 2 *b.* First, as to הוא דמשק אליעזר. Hitzig (on Ps. cxx. 6), Tuch, Olsh., and Kautzsch-Socin take דמ׳ to be a marginal gloss. But what of אליעזר? It is unusual to mention a slave's name. Indeed, if this slave's name had been handed down, should we not have found it mentioned in chap. xxiv.? Clearly אליעזר is corrupt. But

so too is דמ׳, which surely cannot be held to explain either משק or ביתי. The truth is that both דמ׳ אל׳ and the words on which this is said to be a gloss (בן משק ביתי) need correction. משק (like משך, x. 2) is an abridged form, not of משקן, 'client,' a supposed title of Eliezer,[1] but of a regional name of which דמשק, or rather רמשק,[2] is a somewhat fuller form (cp. on כשדים, xi. 28 ; כשד, xxii. 22 ; ממשק, Zeph. ii. 9). The name referred to is אֲרַם־אשחֵר. אליעזר may be a variant of this. אלי, like יאל, may come from ירחמאל, while עזר is a well-attested clan-name, perhaps derived from אַשֶּׁר or עַשֶּׁר. ביתי may be an incorrect expansion of בי, which really comes from an indistinctly written בֵּנֵי, a correction of בֵּן. Thus we get (for *v.* 2 *b*) [ירח׳־אש׳] ובני משק הוא אֲרַם־אש׳, 'the sons of Meshek, *i.e.* of Aram-Ashḥur,' which is a gloss on ערבים ('thy redeemer from the Arabians').—In *v.* 3*b* we find the same gloss transformed anew by the redactor, *i.e.* והנה אתי) והוא בן [בני] אשור ישמעאל comes from בן־ביתי יורש אתי may represent את׳, *i.e.* אתבעל), while in *v.* 2 all between ויאמר and לי, and the whole of *v.* 3 *a*, is the work of the early redactor. Hence the original passage underlying *vv.* 1-3 becomes, 'And Yahweh appeared to Abram in Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el, and said, Fear not, Abram ; I am a shield for thee, I am thy deliverer from the Arabians.' Thus the second part of the speech interprets the first, and the whole gives a much-needed explanation of 'Fear not.'

To the same redactor (who was familiar with the abstract conception of 'faith') are also due *vv.* 4 and 6—a linking passage. Verse 5 apparently comes from a later writer, who loved the Deuteronomic image of the stars (cp. on xxii. 17). It is, however, obvious that something must have followed the divine address to the patriarch. We have therefore to ask whether there is any part of *vv.* 7-18 which would form a suitable sequel, and which, of course, we have no reason for excluding? In reply,

[1] Winckler, *AOF* xxi. 442. Johns (*Bab. and Ass. Laws*, p. 75) explains *mushkênu* (with ב, not ק) as 'a common man.'

[2] 'Ramshaḳ' also underlies מר נשק in the earlier text of 1 K. x. 25 (see *Crit. Bib.* p. 333). Another form is probably רמשח, underlying the corrupt מרוח of Am. vi. 7. Possibly the form דרמשק in Chron. preserves a record of two readings, דמשק and רַמְשַׁק.

vv. 7 *f.* being out of the question (see at a later point), I would indicate *vv.* 9-11 and 17 *f.* I do not, however, mean to assert that this is the whole of the sequel. It is probable that what now stands as *vv.* 4-6 is a substitute for a passage relative to the blessing promised to the seed of the patriarch.

The next textual errors in the passage which probably represents the original narrative occur in *v.* 18 (the limits of the Promised Land). Similar accounts are given elsewhere; see especially Ex. xxiii. 31, Dt. i. 7, xi. 24, Josh. i. 4. In all these passages except that in Exodus[1] the 'stream of Perāth' is mentioned, and in Dt. i. 7 and Josh. i. 4 (as here) הנהר הגדל is prefixed to that phrase (נהר פרת), which may possibly be an early gloss. Most probably, as doubtless in Jer. xiii. 4-7, פרת = אפרת, and refers to a N. Arabian district called Ephrath (see on xxxv. 16). For גדל[ה] we may compare the proper names גדליהו, 2 K. xxv. 22, and גדל, Neh. vii. 49, 58, Ezra ii. 47, 56, and the הגדולים of Neh. xi. 14. In all these forms גדל or הגדול represents גלעד, and in our passage the original reading probably was נהר גלעד. It is noteworthy that the writer of Dan. x. 4 appears to have identified Perāth and Ḥiddeḳel, for he uses the latter name (see on ii. 14) where we might have expected the former.

The writer of *v.* 18 also mentions a stream of מצרים (read Miṣrim). More frequently this is called נחל; see Num. xxxiv. 5, 1 K. viii. 65, etc., and cp. the *naḫal Muṣri* of Sargon and Esar-haddon (*E. Bib.*, cols. 1249 *f.*; Winckl., *KAT*, pp. 147 *f.*). The use of נהר for נחל is remarkable. From xxxvi. 37, Num. xxii. 5, we may perhaps infer that the Israelites in the N. Arabian border-land applied the term נהר to streams which were really no more than torrents (נחלים). Or was the נחל originally a נהר? Possibly the נהר מצרים, like the נ' גלעד, had a second name; *i.e.* it may be the same as the stream called (as we seem obliged to hold—see on xiii. 10) ירחון, a name (derived from ירח = ירחמאל) which sometimes, or even often, underlies the familiar

[1] There is, however, no strong reason to doubt that the stream intended in Ex. xxiii. 31 is the 'stream of Ephrath.' Cp. Dt. xi. 24 (rev. text), 'from the stream, the stream of Ephrath.' Winckler, I am aware, makes נהר פ' in all such contexts a gloss, and supposes that the real northern boundary was the river Liṭâny (*AOF*, 3rd ser. ii. 258 *f.*).

ירדן of the traditional text. There was also, as the MT. itself shows, a stream called the שיחור (*i.e.* אשחור), described in Josh. xiii. 3 as being 'in front of מצרים' (Miṣrim), just as Ḥiddeḳel is described in Gen. ii. 14 as going 'in front of אשור.' Was this another name for the נהר מצרים? Cp. on l. 10, and see *Bible Problems*, p. 269. Lastly, may not ארם נהרים mean properly 'Aram (Yeraḥme'el) of the streams,' or 'of the two streams' (note on xxiv. 10)? See further on Dt. xi. 24.

It is, of course, possible to omit 'from the stream of Miṣrim,' etc., as a later gloss; but what should we gain thereby? As soon as the story took written form, it would be natural enough to give this brief statement of the limits of the 'land.' The view which it embodied failed to satisfy a later age. Not only had N. and S. Palestine to be brought in, but the territory of Abraham's 'seed' had to be extended as far as to the Euphrates. An imperialistic ideal was gratifying to the national pride which resisted the depressing influences of the present. And no doubt it seemed to readers of this passage to be specially warranted by the name פרת, which in a late and unhistorical age was naturally understood as 'Euphrates.' The case is just parallel to that of the description of the territory of Solomon. Whether the empire of this king actually reached to the Euphrates, some critics of mark have already doubted. We now seem to know how the misrepresentation arose. If one cause of it was national pride, another was ignorance of any other stream called *par excellence* הנהר but that called by the Greeks and Romans Euphrates (see on 1 K. v. 1).

As to the ten names of peoples in the appended passage (*vv.* 19-21, cp. Neh. ix. 8), they may have been already corrupted when the late scribe collected and inserted them. The mysterious קדמני ('eastern ones'!), which only occurs here, has probably sprung from רחמני, which is a modification of ירחמאלי (cp. on xvii. 5). On Hittites, Amorites, Canaanites, Girgashites, Jebusites, see on x. 15 *f.*; on Perizzites, on xiii. 7; on Rephaim, on xiv. 5. The difficulty as to the 'Hittites' mentioned by Driver, *ad loc.*, has, I hope I may say, disappeared.

Turning now to *vv.* 7, 8, it may be stated first, without

hesitation, that they are a later insertion, and that their probable object is to link together the two parts of chap. xv. (*vv.* 1-6 and *vv.* 9-18) which the redactor may in some sense be said to have brought into existence. In its original form the passage gives another reference to N. Arabia, אור (see on xi. 28) being most probably a corruption of ערב, and חשרם of כשדים, *i.e.* אַשְׁחֻר־אֲרָם. We thus get, 'who brought thee out of [Arabia] Ashḥur of Aram' (= Ashḥur-Yeraḥ-me'el, see on ix. 20), which is exactly parallel to 'I am thy redeemer from the Arabians.'

The longest insertion (*vv.* 12-16) requires still closer attention on the part of the student. In the text as it stands there is a troublesome discrepancy between *v.* 13 and *v.* 16, *i.e.* the duration of the servitude (four hundred years) specified in *v.* 13 does not tally with the promise of return in the fourth generation in *v.* 16. Either, therefore, 'four hundred years' or the whole of *v.* 16 must—so critics say—be a late insertion, derived perhaps from another source. The truth, however—from the point of view which many textual facts have forced upon us,—seems to be that the original text said nothing about four hundred years;[1] ארבע מאות שנה comes from ערבים אתמאל ישמעאל. The עבדום of MT. actually preserves the true reading, viz. ערבים, on which אתמ׳ (= ישמ׳) and ישמ׳ are glosses. See, further, on the parallel, Ex. xii. 40.

This is confirmed by 𝔊^A in *v.* 13 *b*, *καὶ κακώσουσιν αὐτο*[*υς*] *καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτοὺς καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτούς*, *i.e.* והרעו להם ועבדום וענו אתם, suggesting that in the underlying text ערבים followed וענו אתם. The הרעו להם, presupposed by 𝔊, and the בארץ לא להם of MT., which is also presupposed by 𝔊's *ἐν γῇ οὐκ ἰδίᾳ*, are equally corrupt readings, nor is it (from our point of view) hard to recover the true reading, through which both can be accounted for;

[1] On the confusion between numerals and ethnics, due to the corruption of ethnics, or fragments of ethnics, into forms resembling numerals, see *Hibbert Journal*, vol. i. p. 760 (1903). Note that ארבע represents עֲרַב (or perhaps ערבים); see on 'Kiryath-arba,' xxiii. 2. מאות (cp. אתמאל = אתמול) comes from ישמעאל; שנה, like שן (1 S. xiv. 4), from a fragment of ישמעאלים = ישמנים. Cp. on 1 K. xviii. 19, xxii. 6, Judg. iii. 8, 11, v. 31, etc. That Hebrew writers sometimes reckoned the generation at a hundred years, can hardly be called very probable.

surely it is בארץ ירחמאל. It is this which is represented by בארץ לא להם, and it is a dittographed ירחמאל which accounts for the הרעו להם which we have been able to trace in 𝔊. Read therefore—כי גר יהיה זרעך בארץ ירחמאל [אתמ׳ ישמ׳] ועבו אתם ערבים. It should be added that the doubtfulness of the text is already indicated in MT. by the Paseḳ after כי גר (*v.* 13), and that Winckler's astronomical explanation of *v.* 13[1] is too ingenious by half.

V. 14 is a fit sequel to *v.* 13 in its revised form. It alludes first to the plagues of Miṣrim (Ex. vii. *ff.*), then to the departing of the Israelites with their property (Ex. xii. 25 *f.*, 38). *V.* 15, however, interrupts the connexion, and must be a very late insertion indeed. *V.* 16 connects with *v.* 14. It refers (as Gunkel remarks) to the genealogy of Moses, who appears in the fourth generation from Levi (Ex. vi. 16 *ff.*).

I could wish that this examination might lead to the rectification of much that has been unwisely said about Abraham, the successful leader of a band of warriors, and (as Nikolaus of Damascus, the court-historian of Herod the Great, asserted) the conqueror of Damascus;[2] also that it might put an end to the worn-out problem of the four hundred years of Israel's oppression in 'Egypt.' We need not, as it seems to me, go on theorising as to the origin of this so-called 'artificial calculation,' simply because in the original text no such chronological statement existed. Cp. on Ex. xii. 41.

[1] *Arabisch-semitisch-orientalisch*, p. 20, note 3 (the number 400, ten times the period of Nergal-Pleiades).

[2] See Carl Niebuhr, *Gesch. des Ebräischen Zeitalters*, i. 123, and cp. Winckler's mysterious hint, *KAT*[3], p. 211.

THE FORTUNES OF HAGAR (GEN. XVI.)

THE hard fate of Hagar, the handmaid of Abram's wife, and the handmaid's compensation. Such is the theme of the story, of which another version occurs in xxi. 8-21. To understand it we must ask, first, Who is this Hagar? next, What is her fate? and lastly, What is her compensation? Other questions will then suggest themselves, such as the geography of the story, the meaning of Ishmael and Mal'ak-Yahweh, and the true form of the utterance of the friendly divinity. (1) As to Hagar herself, tradition informs us that she was a Miṣrite. The commentators affirm that *miṣri(th)* both here and elsewhere means 'Egyptian,' but it has been amply shown that this cannot any longer be taken for granted. It is admitted, however, even by the less advanced school, that 'Hagar' reminds us forcibly of the ethnic 'Hagrim,' which belongs to a tribe of Arabian origin mentioned in 1 Chr. v. 10, 19 *f.* (cp. 1 Chr. xxvii. 31, Ps. lxxxiii. 7, and, by emendation, Hos. ix. 13, Isa. x. 4).[1] 'The case is exactly parallel to that of 1 Chr. ii. 34, where a certain Yeraḥme'elite is said to have had a Miṣrite slave called Yarḥa. It is plain that Yarḥa is a corruption of Yeraḥme'el; and yet the commentators go on saying that the slave referred to was an Egyptian. So far as I can see, it is absolutely certain that both Hagar and Yarḥa were, according to the narrators, N. Arabians. Of course, too, in xxi. 21 the narrator meant to say that Hagar

[1] 'Ephraim is like an asshur-tree planted in a park, | But Yeraḥme'el (*gloss*, Miṣṣôr) bringeth forth his (Ephraim's) sons to Hagar' (*i.e.* the Hagrite slave-dealers; cp. Am. i. 6, 9; Joel iv. 6, 8). ירחמאל is doubly represented—by ראיתי ל and [פ]אים ל. See further, p. 268, note 1.

fetched Ishmael a wife out of the land of Miṣrim (not Miṣraim). There is no evidence whatever that Ishmaelites were ever regarded as partly of Egyptian origin.[1] Hagar, therefore, was regarded as a native of Miṣrim in N. Arabia; she need not therefore be supposed to have been wandering aimlessiy in the wilderness when Mal'ak-Yahweh found her.

(2) Now as to the fate of Hagar. Doubtless it was prepared by herself, but it was none the less hard. She had become, by Sarai's own wish, in a qualified sense Abram's concubine, and had borne him a son; upon this she erred by 'placing herself on an equality with her mistress,'[2] and Sarai appealed for justice to Abram. An earlier form of the story may have described the subsequent course of events more definitely. Ḫammurabi's Code says[3] that in such a case the mistress may resume her authority over the maid, and 'reckon her with the slave-girls.' Probably a similar law was in force in the region where this story arose. The writer whom we call the Yahwist does not, however, recognise this. He vaguely states that, unopposed by Abram, Sarai punished her maid so severely that Hagar, who could not bear to be a slave again, and apparently had no confidence in her son's future in the family of Abram, fled.

(3) Now as to the third point: What was Hagar's compensation? It would have been a small thing if she had only been able to flee to 'Shur which is in front of Miṣrim.' This was no doubt the limit of her hopes. She forgot—so the narrative leads us to suppose—that her child would be also the child of Abram, and could not be destined to live in poverty and obscurity. One of the heavenly beings opened her eyes. מלאך יהוה found her by the fountain on the way to Shur (the N. Arabian Asshur), and named the expected child 'Ishmael.' At the same

[1] *Bible Problems*, pp. 167 *f.*

[2] A phrase in Ḫammurabi.

[3] Section 146. Mr. Johns translates, 'her mistress shall not sell her, she shall place a slave-mark upon her, and reckon her with the slave-girls.' But is this exegetically possible? Winckler renders 'zur Sklavenschaft soll er sie thun.' The arrogant maid, whose case is supposed by the law, was a slave at the first; she did not become a slave.

time—as the text stands—the heavenly being predicted the future of the child. He should be as free as the desert ass, and in constant war with every one—a worthy son of his untameable mother. Hagar, for her part, if we are to follow the text, gave יהוה, who had spoken to her, the additional name, 'Attah El-Roi.'

The story before us, together with its parallel in chap. xxi., cannot in its present form (see below) be very old. It is reasonable, however, to admit that the name of Hagar may well be primitive, and that the benê Hagar may have been originally an important section of the Miṣrite people, though they are not mentioned in the list of the sons of Miṣrim in x. 13 *f.*, and the only writers (according to the MT.)[1] who do mention the Hagrites are the Chronicler and a single psalmist. Ishmael too is probably a very old form, though not, as we shall see (p. 272), the original one.

It is difficult, however, not to suppose that in the earliest form of the narrative Ishmael's mother occupied a higher position. Ishmael being Abram's eldest son, his mother cannot always have been represented as a disgraced slave. Once upon a time her flight must have been differently accounted for. Not Abram, whose legitimate wife she must have been,[2] nor yet Sarai, but some more formidable being, must have forced her to become a fugitive. Remembering the story of the flight of a still greater mother into the wilderness[3] (Rev. xii. 6, 14), may we not with some plausibility suppose the enemy of Hagar in the original story to have been the mythic serpent of darkness and disorder?

We can therefore hardly think that the name 'Hagar' is derived either from an Arabic root meaning 'to flee,' or

[1] With much confidence, however, it may be added that 'Hagar' is also mentioned, under the thin disguise of הוֹרֵנִי, in Hos. ix. 13, where (see p. 266, note 1) it represents the Hagrites as a people of slave-dealers, and also in Isa. x. 4, disguised as [חרונ]ים.

[2] The later Arabian legend (see *Tabari*, by Zotenberg, i. 163) accidentally coincides. Hagar (Hâjir) is there the legitimate wife of Abraham, and the vast territory of Arabia is given to Ishmael as the eldest son.

[3] Cp. *Bible Problems*, pp. 77 *ff.*

from a noun 'hagar' which in Ethiopic and in some dialects of Arabic means 'settlement, village, town' (Nöldeke, *E. Bib.*, col. 1933, note 2; cp. Hommel, *Gr.* p. 163, note 3). Some grander origin is certainly to be presumed. The original name must have undergone some modification. Clan-names generally did get worn down in the popular speech. It is possible that the name was originally composite, and that the first element was not Hag, but Ḥag, which we find in several names which may at first have been clan-names. But we are unable at present to explain Ḥag. It should be noticed that no one claims 'Hagar' as an Egyptian name. All that traditionalists can say is that the Egyptian woman who became Sarah's handmaid must have taken a Semitic name when she passed into Asia. But, as we have seen, the traditional theory of Hagar's origin is improbable. See, further, E. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, pp. 326-328.

We now turn to geographical details. The view that 'Shur' (*v.* 7) is a 'wall' or line of fortresses in the N.E. of Egypt is erroneous.[1] Nor is it at all probable that the Egyptian name *aneb* ('wall') or *anebu* ('walls'), borne by a fortress and a tower and a desert-district on the E. border of Egypt,[2] was translated into Hebrew as 'Shur.' From our present point of view we cannot doubt that 'Shur' is a Semitic name for a N. Arabian locality, and bearing in mind the gloss in xxv. 18 (where 'Asshur' takes the place of 'Shur') and the reading *ασσουρ* in $\mathfrak{G}^B$ at 1 S. xv. 7,[3] where MT. has שׁוּר, we may safely hold that 'Shur' is the short for 'Asshur,' just as 'Ḥur' is for 'Ashḥur' and 'Ṣôr' for 'Miṣṣôr.' Asshur or Ashḥur was a region of uncertain extent in N. Arabia, on which see further the note on ii. 14, also *E. Bib.*, 'Shur'; *Bible Problems*, pp. 264 *ff.*; Hommel, *AHT*, pp. 241, 244; Winckler, *Muṣri*, part ii. pp. 6 *f.*

It was therefore on the way to this region, which, as

[1] 'All attempts to construct a gigantic line of fortification, shutting off the whole or half of the isthmus of Suez, are baseless' (W. M. Müller, *As. u. Eur.* p. 45). For W. M. M.'s own view, which has phonetic difficulties, see *As. u. Eur.* pp. 102, 134.

[2] Heyes, *Bib. u. Aeg.* p. 47.

[3] Similarly it is most probable that שור in Job v. 21 is not miswritten for שׂר, but a corruption of אשור = שור (‖ ישמעאל, underlying לשון).

xxv. 18 says, 'fronted Miṣrim,' that Hagar the Miṣrite rested, like Jesus in John iv. 6, at a well. It was a well famous in legend—a well at which probably various tribes were wont anciently to hold periodical meetings, and it is called in our texts Beer-lahai-roi (*v.* 14, xxiv. 62, xxv. 11). Of course, the name is impossible. No one, free from the trammels of tradition, could believe in such a name as 'well of the living one who sees me.' And if we have really worked at the text of the O.T. from the newer point of view, chronicling recurrent types of textual corruption, we shall recognise the true form of name at once. לחי, indeed, has already occupied our attention (see on Judg. xv. 9, and cp. on לחיה, 2 S. xxiii. 11). It comes by transposition from ירחל, *i.e.* ירחמאל; intermediate forms are מחול and רחל. The last element in the name is ראי, which is another corrupt fragment of ירחמאל, which in the original text must have been dittographed (see on *v.* 13). Thus the true name of the well is 'Well of Yeraḥme'el.'[1]

Next, as to the situation of the well; 'surely,' says a gloss, 'it is between Kadesh and Bered.' 'Kadesh' we probably know (see on xiv. 7); but what is ברד? Nestle (*ZATW*, 1901, pp. 329 *ff.*) prefers ברק, which is supported both by 𝔊ᴸ and by Philo (though not in the edited texts). 'Barak' seems to have been a southern clan (*Crit. Bib.* on Judg. iv. 6). This reading, however, looks like a conjecture; ברד may be hard, but will become less so if we compare xx. 1 (xxi. 14), xxv. 18, and 1 S. xxvii. 8. From xx. 1, compared with xxi. 14, we learn that, according to E, when Abram dismissed Hagar and her son, he was dwelling 'between Kadesh and Shur'; from xxv. 18, that the centre of the Ishmaelite country was between Havilah and Shur; and from 1 S. xxvii. 8 (assuming the results of criticism), that 'Ishmael' was 'the land which extends from Yeraḥme'el, in the direction of Asshur, as far as the land of Miṣrim.' In the latter passage the expression is slightly loose; 'Miṣrim' is used where xxv. 18 gives 'Shur,' *i.e.* 'Asshur.' This, however, does not matter, for Shur, we know, was 'in front of Miṣrim' (xxv. 18). Taking all this together, it is plain that ברד must have been very close to,

[1] For other views, see *E. Bib.*, 'Beer-lahai-roi.'

or, more probably, a part of Shur or Asshur. The name cannot, however, be quite correct; it must be either corrupt or imperfect. Eus. and Jer. (*OS* 299, 76; 145, 2) mention a village Berdan in the Gerarite country. This suggests as the possible origin of ברד, ברדן, or, better, בר־דְדָן. The initial בר, as often (*e.g.* ברקוס), probably comes from עֲרַב. In Ezek. xxvii. 20 Dedan is mentioned with עֲרַב (Arabia); in Gen. x. 7, as a son of Cush, for which xxv. 3 gives Jokshan (both names probably come from Ashḥur). Probably, therefore, 'Bered' is the name of the region called 'Arab-dedan,' or 'Dedanite Arabia.' It may fittingly be added here that the 'Havilah' of xxv. 18 (MT.) and the 'Yeraḥme'el' of 1 S. xxvii. 8 (revised text) probably mean the immediate neighbourhood of 'Beer-Yeraḥme'el.' That 'Yeraḥme'el,' often in a corrupted form, should be applied to places and small districts, as well as to a large region, is no strange phenomenon.

It must already be plain that the 'wilderness of Beer-sheba' in the ‖ (xxi. 14) cannot be right. In x. 10 שבא and דדן are brothers. Surely שבע in xxi. 14 should be שבא; or rather, the distinction between שבא and שבע is arbitrary, and both forms are popular corruptions of ישמעאל. Another doubtful word is באר, which in Num. xxi. 16 and Judg. ix. 21 appears to be miswritten for ערב. So probably it is here. The wilderness referred to in xxi. 14 is that of Arab-Ishmael, *i.e.* Ishmaelite Arabia. This will bring the two accounts of the scene of Hagar's wanderings into harmony. Cp. also introduction to chap. xx.

And now as to (*a*) the racial significance of 'Ishmael,' and (*b*) the form of the name. (*a*) According to Gunkel, Ishmael is the legendary impersonation of a nomad people, famous for its bowmen (xxi. 20), of which no historical record has come down to us. The name, he thinks, survived in tradition, and was transferred to several N. Arabian tribes of a later age. He refers to Judg. viii. 24 (cp. *v.* 12), where Midian is reckoned as Ishmaelitish, and to the list of the sons of Ishmael in xxv. 13-15. The last O.T. mention of an Ishmaelite that he can find is in 2 S. xvii. 25, where (cp. 1 Chr. ii. 17) he reads 'Ishmaelite' for 'Israelite.' This view, however, depends on the theory of the general

correctness of the traditional text as regards tribal names. It is highly probable that there are many more references to the Ishmaelites than Gunkel supposes, though in the later books the name 'Ishmael' is doubtless an archaism. A synonym for it is 'Yeraḥme'el' (='Amalek'). Taking it as a tribal or regional name, we may group it with Ishma (1 Chr. iv. 3), Shema, Sheba, Shemuel, Shebuel, Shunem, Shean (in Beth-shean), also with Shem (see on v. 32), and שמם in the much-disputed phrase שקוץ ש', *i.e.* beyond doubt 'the idol of Ishmael,' Dan. xii. 11 (cp. p. 18). That the Ishmaelites were merely a nomad people, is too much to assert. The passage referred to by Gunkel (xxi. 20) is corrupt, and there were two sections of Ishmaelites or Yeraḥme'elites, a more and a less advanced in civilisation. That the race was one of great antiquity may, however, be frankly admitted. Indeed, the superior antiquity of Ishmael or Yeraḥme'el (=Amalek) appears to have been admitted by Israelitish writers. Shem (*i.e.* Ishmael) and Ḥam (*i.e.* Yeraḥme'el) were reckoned as sons of Noaḥ; originally, however, Shem and Ḥam were equivalent (cp. on v. 32, x. 1). See, further, on Num. xxiv. 20. (*b*) As to the form of the name 'Ishmael.' At first sight it appears to be a compound of a verb in the imperfect and the most general Hebrew word for 'God,' and means 'God hears' (*v.* 11); cp. ישמעיהו (1 Chr. xxvii. 19), and see Nöldeke, *E. Bib.*, 'Names,' § 33. Names of this type, however, in the N. Semitic languages are very deceptive. Often they have reached their present form comparatively early by systematic manipulation, and in their original forms were not, as they may appear to be when transformed, expressions of religious faith. This is the case with ישמעאל (and ישמעיהו), ירחמאל, ישראל, יחזקאל, as well as with the shorter forms יצחק, יעקוב, יוסף. Is it possible to trace the original form of Ishmael, and to explain its meaning? If שם were really a name of the moon-god (Winckler, *Ar.-sem.-or.* p. 112) we might perhaps base a theory upon this, שמואל being certainly a by-form of ישמעאל, and ירחם *possibly* equivalent to ירח with 'mimation' (see p. 28). More plausibly we might hold that 'Ishmael' originally had to do with the sun-god, or, more precisely, that ישמעאל sprang from שמשאל, just as afterwards, when

'Ishmael' as the name of a collection of tribes had gone out of use, and when early N. Arabian history had been forgotten, ישמ׳ sometimes became שמש—the very same confusion which certainly took place in very early times. If so, the sun and the moon deities would both have been worshipped by the tribes referred to—the sun and the moon, which are the original Gemini, whose cultus in Canaan and Arabia may have begun very early.

The evidence of the confusion of שמש and שמע in Semitic languages may be here briefly appended. There is first the place-name בית שמש, commonly but wrongly explained 'temple of the sun'; really it is = ב׳ ישמע or ישמעאל. Cp. Jer. xliii. 13, where 'Beth-shemesh in the land of Egypt' is surely impossible;[1] *interpret* 'Beth-Ishmael,' and all is plain, for 'Miṣrim' (point מִצְרַיִם) was regarded as Yeraḥme'elite (see on x. 6). We can now understand why, in 1 S. vi. 12, the *'arōn* (ark?) goes straight to Beth-shemesh (Beth-Ishmael), for the god 'Ishmael' was a member of the divine duad represented by the *'arōn* (see p. 35); also why, in Judg. xiii. 24, Manoah's wife calls her son Shimshon, *i.e.* 'one belonging to שמש = ישמעאל,' for it was the god 'Ishmael' or 'Yeraḥme'el' who had announced the child's birth. Next, there is a Galilæan place-name in the Thotmes-list,[2] corresponding to the Hebrew form שִׁמְשׁ-אדם, which has apparently come from Ishmael-Edom, a transferred name. Nor must we omit the late personal name שמשי (Ezra iv. 8), corresponding to σαμελλιος (or σεμ. or σεβ.) in 1 Esd. ii. 17, *i.e.* ישמעאל (cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Shimshai'). Nor must the probability be ignored that in Ps. lxxii. 5, cxxi. 6, Isa. xlix. 10, the traditional text gives שמש, where the sense requires us to interpret ישמעאל. In Ps. lxxii. 5, for instance, it is plain that the context requires us to take עם-שמש as 'the people of . . . ,' and פני ירח (בני) as 'the sons of . . .'

N. Semitic inscriptions reveal similar phenomena. Thus לשמש (Lidzb., p. 304; Cooke, p. 275) must be a popular distortion of ישמעאל; שמשגרם (L. 379; C. 298) of ישמ׳ גמר; and ברשמש (L. 246) of ערב ישמ׳; while מקם שמש

[1] See Cornill's note, with its eloquent varieties of type.
[2] W. M. Müller, *As. u. Eur.* p. 316.

(L. 316)—the name of a city—means probably 'place of Ishmael,' *i.e.* 'Ishmaelite settlement.' Most probably, too, we may add Shamshi-atom, a name on an Egyptian stele of the New Kingdom;[1] Samsi-iluna, the name of Ḫammurabi's son and heir;[2] Samsi, the name of a queen of Aribu, temp. Tiglath-Pileser, and in an Assyrian deed (Johns, *Deeds*, iii. § 275); also Samas-abûa (Johns, *ibid.* § 680).[3]

Still I hesitate to explain 'Ishmaʿ' or Ishma''el' as 'sun-god,' just as I do not venture to interpret 'Yarḥam' or 'Yeraḥme'el' as 'moon-god.' Of course, these explanations may conceivably have been given, but we cannot safely affirm that they are correct. All that can safely be said of this deity (Yeraḥme'el-Ishmael) has been already collected (see pp. 27 *ff.*). Let me only add that the Ishmaelites or Yeraḥme'elites were the people which worshipped and perhaps claimed descent from the deity whose name we have been considering. Their land, too, bore the same name.

In the narrator's explanation of the name 'Ishmael' we find the strange phrase 'has heard thy affliction.' Surely this is wrong, and for עניך we should read אניתך, 'thy sighing.' Greater difficulties meet us in *v.* 12. As so often, the skill of the redactor in making a plausible sense out of miswritten words may be admired, and yet we cannot profess to be satisfied. The phrases which at once excite suspicion are פֶּרֶא אָדָם and עַל־פְּנֵי. What can the former phrase mean? 'A wild ass of (among) men'? 'A wild-ass-man' (cp. *aḳrabu amîlu*, 'a scorpion-man,' in the Gilgamesh epic)? The phrase might be accepted (cp. König, *Synt.* § 337*c*) if we are at liberty to regard *v.* 12 as a fragment of a traditional song. But (1) can *v.* 12 be so regarded? The last clause in it is weak enough, for xxv. 18 does not permit us to admit that על־פני is a vigorous idiom meaning 'unpleasantly close to' (see Gunkel). And (2) does not the

[1] W. M. Müller, *As. u. Eur.* p. 316; Sayce, *HCM*, p. 331. The name originally meant, not 'my sun-goddess is Edom' (Hommel), but 'Ishmael-Edom.'

[2] The name meant originally 'Ishmael-Yeraḥme'el.' So the name Ḫammurabi is probably = Yeraḥme'el-ʿarâb (cp. on 'Ḥam,' v. 32).

[3] Note also the Assyrian name Shashmai (Johns, p. 241), and סַסַּמַי, a Yeraḥme'elite (1 Chr. ii. 40) and also (Cooke, p. 80) a Phœnician name.

comparison of Ishmael to a wild ass give a one-sided view of the Ishmaelitish character, and one which was most unlikely to find mention in a consolatory address to Ishmael's mother? For though one section of the Ishmaelites (or Yeraḥme'elites) was unprogressive, the other was by no means behindhand in culture.[1] Indeed, a people of mere Bedawis would never have received such a blessing as that in xvii. 20 (cp. xxi. 13, 18), which is as warmly expressed as it could be, and must be to some extent our guide here.

Turning now to *v.* 12, we notice that יהיה, like יהוה, is a possible corruption of ירח׳ (=ירחמאל), that פרא in Hos. viii. 9 has sprung from עָרֵב,[2] that אדם should often (*e.g.* in Zech. ix. 1) be אֶרֶם, that ידו בכל and יד כל בו resemble a number of certain corruptions (*e.g.* ירבעל, and בודד לו in Hos. *l.c.*), and that אחיו, like אחר, may (as in xxii. 21, 2 S. vi. 3, etc.) have come from אשחור, and lastly that הוא is a common introduction to glosses. If we give due weight to these considerations, we must admit that we have good ground for correcting *v.* 12 thus—הוא [ירחמאל] עָרֵב אֶרֶם [ירח׳] ועל-פני כל-אשחור ישכן. The several fruitless attempts to write ירחמאל (=ארם) correctly need not surprise us; parallels for this are not exactly rare. Passing over these attempts, we get this statement, 'that is, Arab-Aram; he dwells to the east of all Ashḥur.' To illustrate this see on xxv. 18, and cp. 1 Chr. v. 10, where certain Reubenites are said to have expelled the Hagrites, whose tents were situated על-כל-פני מזרח לגלעד. Verse 12, then, is no part of the narrative; it is a gloss which defines Ishmael's proper territory as Arammite Arabia, and as eastward of all the parts of the N. Arabian Ashḥur.[3]

We now address ourselves to the explanation of *v.* 13 *a.* Gunkel has already inferred that the God of whom the legend speaks was originally not Yahweh, but bore some

[1] Cp. 1 S. xxx. 29, 'the cities of the Yeraḥme'elites.'

[2] See also on פרא, Jer. ii. 24; יערף, Hos. x. 2; ארפכשד, x. 22; רפאים, xiv. 5; פרע, xli. 50; אפרים, xli. 51.

[3] It is no objection to the above correction of פרא אדם that the text-reading is apparently presupposed in Enoch lxxxix. 11 (the wild ass = Ishmael, the progenitor of the Arabs), for the date of the Dream-visions, as Charles has shown, is the time of Judas Maccabæus.

other name, and that this name (El-roʿi) was afterwards regarded as a title of the local Yahweh. The first part of this statement appears to be correct, but not the latter. It is true that El-roʿi might be used as a title, but not 'Attah el-roʿi,' which is the name given by Hagar according to the traditional text. What we have to find out now is the text which underlies אתה אל ראי; *that* ought to give us the name of the God of whom the legend originally spoke. At once we see that אתה, 'thou,' and ראי, 'seeing,' cannot be right.[1] The parallels of רעואל, ראובל (see on xxix. 32), and אריאל show that ראי has come from ירחמאל—*i.e.* ראי'.[2] As for אתה אל, it is probably a corruption of אתבאל = ישמעאל (cp. on אתבעל, 1 K. xvi. 31). By a natural error the scribe wrote 'Ethbaal' (Ishmael) for 'Yeraḥme'el,' and left the error side by side with the correction. That the true reading is 'Yeraḥme'el' appears from the second half of the verse.

'For she said, Have I also seen after him that saw me?' Stucken uses this as material for the comparative study of Eastern mythology, in connexion with the myth of Orpheus and Eurydice. But where in the narrative itself are we told that Hagar looked after the divinity as he left her? and had she done so, how could she have survived (cp. xix. 17, 'look not behind thee')? The Biblical texts should not be used uncriticised. Wellhausen's correction of the impossible הלם (which means, not 'here,' but 'hither') into אלהים is plausible, but, as a whole, his correction just fails to be satisfactory.[3] Experience of equally corrupt passages, however, ought not to leave us baffled. אחרי and אחר are very often miswritten for אַשְׁחֹר, and ראי (see above) is a fragment of ירחמאל. הלם comes from a dittographed ירחמאל.[4] 'Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el' appears to be the full name of the N. Arabian deity who was combined by the Israelites with Yahweh (see p. 23). Thus we get the sense, 'And

[1] It is arbitrary to regard אתה (אִתָּהּ) as a variant of אליה (Ball), and ראי as an archaic name for a kind of antelope, so that לחי ראי (*v.* 14) would mean 'the Jawbone of the Antelope' (Wellh., Ball, Gunkel).

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Reuel'; Winckler, *GI* i. 210, note 4.

[3] *Prolegomena* (1883), p. 344, note 2.

[4] Cp. יהלם, the 'Yeraḥme'elite' precious stone.

she called the name of (the) Yahweh who spoke to her, Yeraḥme'el; for she said, Have I even seen Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el?'[1]

Nor is this the only compound divine name which we find in this chapter. We meet here for the first time with the mysterious Being called מלאך יהוה. The current attempts to explain this expression not being very satisfactory, I may perhaps be excused for renewing the investigation.

First, what is the problem before us? It is to account for the fact that the personage called מלאך י׳ or מ׳ אלהים is not a mere messenger of Yahweh, but equivalent to Yahweh or Elohim himself. See, in the present narrative, *v.* 13 and cp. *v.* 7; also xxii. 1, cp. 11; Ex. iii. 4, cp. 2; xiii. 21, cp. xiv. 19; Judg. vi. 14, cp. 12; Judg. xiii. 23, cp. 3, etc. And this is complicated by the equally certain fact that in some sense the מ׳ י׳ is distinguishable from Yahweh himself (see *v.* 11, and cp. xix. 13, 24, Num. xxii. 31).

Next, as to the solution. The ordinary view (see *e.g.* Gray, *E. Bib.*, col. 5035) that 'the angel of Yahweh is an occasional manifestation of Yahweh in human form, possessing no distinct and permanent personality,' could not be satisfactory, being drawn entirely from exegetical data, without a criticism of the text, and without reference to the history of ancient cults. Taking the latter point first, one must, from a historical point of view, suppose the personage called in our texts *mal'ak Yahweh* to have been a divine being with a distinct personality. Let us look round and see if the religious inscriptions of neighbouring peoples supply any confirmatory evidence. (1) There is a Palmyrene inscription (see Cooke, pp. 268 *f.*) where mention is made of a deity called מלכבל. From the Greek and Latin transliterations, Lidzbarski infers that this represents מַלְאַךְ בֵּל, 'messenger of Bel,' which he supposes to be a title of Shamash the sun-god. The objection is that Šamaš was the chief god of the Palmyrenes, and that Bel and Šamaš were the same; מלכבל seems to await a better explana-

[1] Cp. the combination Ashtar-Kemosh in the inscription of Mesha. Note also that Ashur and Ramman made a divine duad in Assyria (Hommel, *Gr.* p. 87, note 2).

tion.[1] (2) It is an undoubted fact that among the Babylonians the different chief gods, and also the gods collectively, had their respective messengers, who were themselves divine, and, indeed, when the chief gods were concerned, were members of their own families. Thus Marduk was the 'exalted messenger'[2] (*sukkallu ṣiru*) of his father Ea, and Nabu of his father Marduk, and there was a god of a lower rank called Papsukkal, who was the 'messenger of the great gods.' Papsukkal, however, is not great enough to be brought into comparison with the *mal'ak Yahweh*, and if *mal'ak Yahweh* is really a title of a superior divine messenger, the personal name of the messenger would require to be prefixed, or at least given in the context. We might, of course, suppose that the Hebrew writers omitted this name out of reverence for the 'God of gods'—Yahweh. But is there not a better theory, one which takes account more completely both of Babylonian religious usage and of the facts of the history of Jewish religion? (3) Considering, first, how often in the traditional texts old and no longer understood names are disguised or transformed by scribes and redactors, and next, that a great superhuman personage, representing Yahweh, is referred to in the later literature, whose name is composed of the same letters as מלאך, with the addition of another (which may conceivably point to the true origin of the name), we may approach the problem once more with a good hope of success.

Let us now turn again to Babylon. There we find the great god Marduk, the son of Ea, placing himself at his divine father's disposal, especially in matters which concern mankind. 'Ea is rarely approached directly. At his side stands his son Marduk, who acts as a mediator. Marduk listens to the petition addressed to him by the exorcising priest on behalf of the victim, and carries the word to Father Ea. The latter, after first declaring Marduk to be

[1] מלכבל is most probably a compound of מלך = ירחמאל and בל = בעל (a divine title). Cp. יהבול, compounded of ירח, 'moon,' and בל = בעל. For the inscription see Cooke, p. 268, etc.

[2] See the Assyrian lexicons of Del. and Muss-Arnolt, art. *sukkallu*, and cp. Zimmern, *KAT*[3], p. 454. On the S. Arabian divine messengers, see Hommel, *Gr.* p. 86.

his equal in knowledge, proceeds to dictate the cure.'[1] This is specially illustrative of the statement of Mal'ak-Yahweh in Genesis (xvi. 11) that 'Yahweh hath hearkened to thy sighing.' It is not, indeed, stated that Marduk appeared upon earth in human form, but naïve Israelitish narrators may well have stated that the divine representative of Yahweh, 'in his love and in his pity' (Isa. lxiii. 9), did as much. But who was Yahweh's divine representative? Surely in the original story he must have been mentioned by name; what, then, was his name? It must, as we have seen, underlie מלאך and מיכאל. Now, it is certain that מלאך, like מלך,[2] in the traditional text is sometimes (cp. on Lev. xviii. 21, 2 S. xi. 1) either a scribal or a popular distortion of ירחמאל, and in the highest degree plausible that מיכאל, the prince-angel in Daniel and later writings, is a degraded (but not dishonoured) god, *i.e.* is a reflexion (and that a bright one) of the N. Arabian deity known to the Israelites as Yeraḥme'el (ירחמאל). There is therefore a twofold justification, text-critical and historical, for the view that מלאך in the phrase מ' י' (or מ' [ה]אלהים) in xvi. 7, xxi. 17, etc., and probably also המלאך in xlviii. 16, מלאך in Ex. xxiii. 20, מלאכי in xxiii. 23, xxxii. 34, Mal. iii 1, and מלאכו in Gen. xxiv. 7, 40, have been produced by late redactors out of מיכאל, a name which is an edifying transformation of ירחמאל. The influence of the N. Arabian border-land (for the possession of which Israel strove persistently) on the people of Yahweh was so strong that Yahweh and Yeraḥme'el came to be popularly combined in a divine duad, or, with the addition of Ashḥur[3] (primitively Ashtart), in a triad, and though Yahweh asserted his pre-eminence, yet Yeraḥme'el was honoured by the title of 'Face of Yahweh' (Ex. xxxiii. 14), and regarded as the repository of the 'name of God' (Ex. xxiii. 21).

[1] Jastrow, *Rel. of Bab. and Ass.* p. 276; cp. pp. 139, 279, and Zimmern, *KAT*(3), p. 419; Jastrow, *J. of Am. Theol.* i. 474.

[2] Cp. למך (iv. 18) and קמואל, xxii. 21. Note also that מלך in Phœnician and *malik* in Babylonian and Assyrian proper names comes from 'Yeraḥme'el' (carried from N. Arabia), and that *malaka* in the Edomite king's name Ḳauš-malaka has the same origin.

[3] See on *v.* 13, Dt. xxxiii. 29. Ashḥur is equivalent to Ashtor, and Ashtor was originally a goddess (Ashtart). See, further, on i. 26.

Thus מ׳ יהוה (the phrase now before us) represents ירחמאל יהוה. The more obvious order יהוה ירח׳ is here inverted, perhaps because the deity was spoken of as interfering for Israel. It was natural, however, that those who redacted the earlier narratives should seek to guard the supremacy of Yahweh by modifying the word ירחמ׳, and the phrase מל׳ י׳, once produced, would propagate itself further. For the phrase מל׳ אלהים see on xxi. 17, and for מלאכי אל׳ on xxxii. 2.

I may mention here that Nielsen (*Die altarab. Mondreligion*, 1904, p. 148) seeks to show exegetically that מל׳ אל׳ in Ex. xiv. 19 really means the moon (ירח); also that Renan (*Hist. d'Israel*, i. 287), after speaking of the מ׳ י׳ as a sort of double of Yahweh, remarks, 'Indeed, it is not certain that the Moloch or Milk of the Canaanite religion does not owe its origin to the same order of ideas.' Moloch or Milk, however, is really Yerahme'el (see p. 51).

THE THIRD AGE OF THE WORLD, BEGINNING WITH THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT (GEN. XVII. 1-L. 26; but cp. on XII. 1, etc.).

CHAP. xvii. The Abrahamic covenant. Its sign, the rite of circumcision. Change of names of the favoured pair. Promised birth of a son. Abraham's laugh. Promise for Ishmael. The rite performed.

The Priestly Writer (P) divides the history of mankind, and more especially of the Arabian peoples akin to the Israelites, into four periods, each introduced by a divine revelation. The first begins with Adam, and the name of God employed in the narrative is Elohim. The second begins with Noaḥ; the divine name is still Elohim. The third with Abram; here the divine name is El Shaddai (?). The fourth with Moses; here the divine name is Yahweh. It is highly probable, though the proof falls short of demonstration, that the theory is also Babylonian,[1] and considering the commanding position of Babylon in the Priestly Writer's time, it is just possible (see, however, below) that he derived it from this great teacher of the nations. At the same time, the division of the history of human affairs into periods is very widely spread, and the sacredness of the number four has sprung from cosmogonic notions familiar to many primitive tribes.[2] The Iranians certainly had the theory of

[1] See Zimmern, *KAT*(3), pp. 542 *f.*; Gunkel, *Genesis*(2), p. 233. Jeremias, however, makes seven periods (*ATAO*, p. 122).

[2] The four corners of earth and heaven had an inherent sanctity. The four specially holy angels of the later Israelites were originally the four gods of the four 'ends' of the earth and heaven, living pillars of the celestial world. The idea is both Egyptian and N. American, to say no more.

four periods,[1] and they, too, had an increasing influence upon the Jews. Daniel's vision of the four beasts and the Priestly Writer's four periods need not, therefore, be of directly Babylonian origin.

On the whole, the most plausible view is that the Israelites derived the four-ages theory from the Arabian race, of which they are a junior offshoot, and that in its pre-Israelite form each of the periods was distinguished by the emergence of a fresh divine name or title. Similarly, according to P, the name El-Shaddai (?) was first revealed to Abram, and the name Yahweh to Moses (see Ex. vi. 3). There is great difficulty, however, in the former statement. Neither El-Shaddai nor Shaddai occurs anywhere else in the narratives of the Hexateuch, except, indeed, in xliii. 14 (E), where most recent critics ascribe it, not to E, but to a late redactor. Nor does P give any help in explaining the name. Modern scholars have therefore either acquiesced in nescience, or explained it, with superficial plausibility, from Aramaic or Assyrian. Of these explanations two have found special favour[2]—'he who pours forth,' *i.e.* the rain-giver (Aram. שְׁדָא), and 'mountain' (Ass. *šadû*) or 'my mountain' (Ass. *sadûa*). New varieties of the latter have been produced by Radau (*Creation-story of Gen.* i. pp. 58 *f.*), viz. 'God of the two mountains,'[3] and by Hommel (*Gr.* p. 177, note 3), viz. *šadû Ai*, or *šadd Ai*, *i.e.* 'mountain + moon,' in accordance with his theory of primitive Semitic moon-worship. It is hoped, however, that by applying a key which has proved successful elsewhere, we may attain, if not to certainty, yet to a more satisfactory result.

The revelation by which the third stage of human

[1] Cp. *Bahman Yast*, i. 3 (*SBE* v. 192). 'That root of a tree which thou sawest, and those four branches, are the four periods which will come.' They are (1) of gold; (2) of silver; (3) of steel; (4) mingled with iron.

[2] For notices of the conflicting views see *E. Bib.*, 'Shaddai,' and 'Names,' § 117; Delitzsch, *Hebrew Language*, p. 48; Zimmern, *KAT*[3], pp. 358, 460 *ff.*; Jastrow, *RBA*, pp. 56, 278, 500; W. R. Smith, *OTJC*[1], p. 424; Cheyne, *Prophecies of Isaiah*, on Isa. xiii. 6, with crit. note in vol. ii.

[3] Identifying Yahweh with EN-LIL, the god of the upper and lower mountain, *i.e.* heaven and earth (*ai* the old dual ending).

history is inaugurated is short and simple. The God who reveals himself under the name El-Shaddai (?) demands a life in accordance with his will, and on this condition makes a *bĕrîth* or 'engagement' with Abram, guaranteeing him certain blessings, and distinguishing him and his posterity from the worshippers of other gods by the sign of circumcision.[1] The blessings referred to are (1) the supernatural multiplication of his posterity, which shall develop into great nations (Israel, Edom, Aram) governed by kings, and (2) the possession by the most favoured race of the land of Canaan. But how is this posterity to be obtained? A myth may perhaps have been current among the Canaanites that a new race of men arose after the deluge out of stones duly cast by the survivors (see p. 126). Such a myth would have suggested a means of 'raising up children unto Abraham.' Later Jews had certainly been affected by this idea, as Isa. li. 1 and Luke iii. 8 show. If the narrators pass it over, this may be simply because they are consistently adverse to the mythological tendency in Israel. What they tell us is that Yahweh or Elohim pledged his word that Sarah should have a son, also that Sarah (so J) or Abraham (so P) 'laughed' at the idea of a child under such circumstances, and so find an explanation of the name 'Isaac.' The divine communication does not touch this point. And it is worthy of remark that the name is neither modified nor changed by any subsequent revelation. Presumably this would have appeared inappropriate. If 'Abram' and 'Sarai' are changed, it is because these names were not in the first instance divinely given.

The promises are closely connected with divinely appointed changes in the names of the recipients. 'Abram,' (presumably understood by P as 'high father') becomes 'Abraham,' *i.e. ab hămōn gōyīm*, 'father of a swarm of nations,' as if *rāhām* and *hămōn* had sufficient resemblance to set simple religious minds thinking.[2] Such at least is the

[1] Of the original meaning and early historical significance of circumcision, the Priestly Writer shows no sense. Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Covenant,' § 6.

[2] For the disregard of ר, it would be unwise to refer to v. 29, where, according to MT., נח is explained by a reference to נחם, for 𝔊 implies

ordinary view, though some[1] have ventured on the supposition that P had an intimate acquaintance with rare Arabic words, and identified *r-h-m* with the word (found in the *Ḳamûs*) *ruhām*, which, for the sake of ordinary readers, he translated into Hebrew as *hămōn*. Evidently, neither explanation is better than a makeshift. We shall presently have to examine the text. First, however, we must see what can be done with 'El-Shaddai.'

As to the origin of this name,[2] if the popular religion of the Israelites arose in N. Arabia, we are bound to assume that the special names of the God of Israel had N. Arabian affinities. That this is the case with the names Yahweh and Elohim, with El-ʿelyōn (xiv. 19, 22), El-ʿōlām (xxi. 33), and El-beth-el (xxxv. 7), is shown elsewhere; there is also a strong probability (as we shall in due time see) that מאל אביך in xlix. 25 is a corruption of אַבִּיר ירחמאל, 'the Steer-god of Yeraḥme'el.' The latter restoration suggests, as a correction of שדי in the parallel line, אֵל אַשּׁוּר, 'the God of Asshur,' where 'Asshur,' of course, is the N. Arabian region of that name, and is virtually synonymous with 'Yeraḥme'el.' Valuable evidence is also derivable from Dt. xxxiii. 26, 29. In *v.* 26 we meet with the phrase אל ישרון, where ישרון is probably an expansion of אַשֶּׁר; in *v.* 29 with אשר, which Hommel would point אָשֵׁר (as an alternative name for יהוה), but which should perhaps rather be pointed אַשֶּׁר (see p. 24). Surely it is now not difficult to explain אל שדי, or, as we sometimes find, שדי (Num. xxiv. 4, 16, and elsewhere). שדי has most probably arisen out of an early scribe's error, and represents שרי, *i.e.* Shūrī = Asshūrī. It is therefore equivalent to שרין, the Sidonian name for חרמון, which probably comes from שר = אַשֶּׁר, as חרמון comes from ירחם. Note especially that in Jer. xviii. 14 שדי has evidently come from שרי = שרין. We must also compare ישרון, to which in Dt.

יניחנו (see *ad loc.*). Note that Jerome was well aware that the ר was otiose if Abraham is = 'father of a multitude.' In the *Liber Interpretationis Hebr. Nominum* he renders 'pater videns populum,' taking ר as a fragment of ראה, but in the *Quaestiones* he gives '*pater multarum gentium.*'

[1] Against this see Dillmann, *Genesis.*

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Shaddai'; 'Names,' § 117. Meyer, p. 283, note 6, has no suggestion.

xxxiii. 26 אל is prefixed. Cp. xlix. 25, Dt. xxxiii. 17, Ps. cvi. 37, where שדים represents אֲשֵׁרִים, *i.e.* the various local forms of the god Asshur (see p. 24).

Next as to the name Abram. That it was originally a divine name[1] cannot safely be inferred from the supposed appropriateness of the meaning, for Abram does not properly mean 'high father,' and we find the name 'Abiram' (Bab. Abu-ramu) and other names of the same type borne by individual men. Nor may we even assert with Winckler that Abraham has two names in the tradition, unconnected, though the case of Jacob and Israel may well at first sight seem favourable to this view. Stucken,[2] followed by Winckler, holds that Abraham corresponds to the mythological Tamûz and Sarah to Ishtar, but this view has at any rate no bearing on the name Abraham, and Sarai's (or Sarah's) relationship to Abram was not necessarily suggested by the Tamûz and Ishtar myth. Possibly Abraham was originally a first man, in which case Sarah was at once his sister and his wife, a detail which was too firmly fixed in tradition to be displaced. At any rate, the identification of Abraham with the Nabatæan god Dusares[3] seems to me to lack any great verisimilitude.

It is, of course, a plausible conjecture that in an earlier form of the tradition Abraham had another totally different name, but, if so, we have not the means of recovering it. Ram and Raham both have the same meaning, for the one comes from Aram and the other (through Raḥam[4]) from Yarḥam or Yeraḥme'el, and Aram and Yarḥam or Yeraḥme'el are virtually the same (see on x. 23). A few parallel names help us greatly. In 1 Chr. ii. 9, Ram is a brother, and in *v.* 25 a son, of Yeraḥme'el. That רהם or רחם is also

[1] On the whole question as to 'Abram' and 'Abraham,' see Nöldeke, *E. Bib.*, col. 1182, and essay in *Im neuen Reich*, 1871, pp. 508 *ff.*; Winckler, *GI* ii. 26; Baethgen, *Beiträge*, pp. 154 *ff.*

[2] *Astralmythen*, p. 18.

[3] In spite of Ed. Meyer's renewed able defence of this view, *op. cit.* pp. 267 *ff.*; cp. *ZATW* vi. 16. On 'Dusares,' see further Cooke, pp. 218 *f.*; Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, pp. 74 *f.*

[4] The weakening of רחם into רהם need not surprise us (cp. on הם in xiv. 5). אברהם might have been mistranslated 'father of the womb.' Cp. πατὴρ οἰκτιρμῶν (*OS* 172) = אב רחמים.

another form of ירחם, appears from 1 Chr. ii. 44, where, in a Calebite list, both רחם and רקם are most easily explained as popular corruptions of ירחם; also from Isa. xxix. 22, where 𝔊's *ὃν ἀφώρισεν ἐξ Αβρααμ* represents a misunderstood reading אשר פדה מֵרחם, 'whom he redeemed from Raḥam' (*i.e.* Yarḥam), and from Gen. xlix. 25, where רחם, as we shall see, represents the divine name Raḥam or Yarḥam.[1]

May we now proceed to explain Abram (and its Bab. and Ass. parallel Abu-râmu = אבירם) and Abraham as 'father of Aram' and 'father of Yarḥam' respectively? The interpretation of *ab* as 'father' in such names may indeed be an old one, but it is certainly incorrect. The theory according to which *ab* or *abi*, *aḥ* or *aḥi*, and *ḥamu* or *ḥami* in compound proper names refer to the divinity as the close kinsman of his worshipper, plausible as it can in some cases be made, will not cover nearly all the phenomena, and is apparently doubted by such an able scholar as Ed. Meyer.

A new theory is therefore sadly wanted. It is in the highest degree probable that אב and אבי, like אבי by itself in iv. 20 etc., and like the אבי appended (without Maḳḳef) to חירם in 2 Chr. ii. 12, iv. 16 (so read—see on Ex. xxxi. 6), are modified shorter forms of אבר = עֵרֶב, just as אח and אחי more than probably are of אשחֵר, and חמו or חמי of ירחם.[2]

Thus 'Abram' and 'Abraham' mean respectively 'Arammite Arabia' and 'Yeraḥme'elite Arabia.' Cp. the Hebrew names Aḥiram = Ashḥur-Aram, Aḥ'ab = Ashḥur-'Arâb;[3] also the Babylonian names[4] Abiḥar = Arab-ashḥar (ashḥur), Abi-iḳâmu = Arab-yarḥamu, Aḥi-iḳâmu = Ashḥur-yarḥamu; also the Edomite royal name Malik-râmu,[5] temp. Sennacherib (= Heb. and Phœn. מלכירם), and Bilrâm

[1] That רחם or ירחם is not only the name of a people, but of that people's God, is shown on chap. i.

[2] Cp. König's remark as to the 'extraordinary contraction and abbreviation, especially in frequently used expressions' (*Lehrgeb.* ii. 448, note 1 *a*).

[3] In spite of all that has been said, *e.g.* by Ulmer (*Die semit. Eigennamen*, Th. 1, pp. 14 *ff.*), and by *BDB*, to explain אחאב, few will admit that they are fully satisfied. From our present point of view, however, Aḥ'ab (= Aḥi'ab, the name of Herod's nephew) is Ashḥur-'Arâb (p. 63, note 4).

[4] Peiser, *KB* iv. 15; Johns, *Deeds*, iii. 468, 473.

[5] So Winckler, *KAT*(3), p. 232; Zimmern, p. 467, Aja-rammu.

(= Phœn. בעלרם) on a cuneiform tablet found at Tell Ta'annek, where *malik* and *bil* represent 'Yeraḥme'el' and *râm* or *rammu* comes from 'Aram.' It should be added that Breasted[1] has found in Sheshonḳ's list of names at Karnak a phrase which may represent פחקל אברם, 'the country of Abram,' where 'Abram' may, if I am right, be a district name, meaning (like the personal name Abram) 'Arammite Arabia.' To suppose that it means the 'field' on which the sacred tree of Hebron (xiii. 18) stood,[2] seems to me improbable.

Now as to P's explanation—so puzzling to the critics—'thy name shall be Abraham, for I appoint thee אב המון גוים.' Can this be right? Is it likely that the dignity to which the patriarch, according to the original writing, was appointed was so vaguely described? It would seem that P must have made use of an earlier writing which he misread. Corruption there is in any case, and the centre of it lies in המון. Now if חמול (xlvi. 12) and מחול (1 K. v. 11) come from ירחמאל, why should not המון have the same origin, for in the change of ה into ח and of the final ן into ל there is certainly nothing violent? המון, then, is equivalent to רחמון (רחמן), and this is a popular modification of the great tribal name already mentioned; for a parallel compare 'Baal-hamon' in Cant. viii. 11. This, then, is the original form of the twice-uttered divine promise, 'Thou shalt be (or, I appoint thee) father of Raḥman (Yeraḥme'el),' to which as a gloss is added גוים (see on ב', xiv. 2). The meaning is, that the people which was to spread so widely and become so famous should own the patriarch as its ancestor, and that the patriarch himself was to count his ancestorship such an honour that he would resign his earlier name (whatever it may have been) and adopt the name Ab-raḥam. This suggests that in the earlier form of the narrative Ishmael (= Yeraḥme'el), and not Isaac, was the child of promise. Evidently P has dealt very freely with the material before him. Of course, the parallels, xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, xlviii. 4 are based upon the passage as shaped by P.

[1] *AJSL*, Oct. 1904; cp. Spiegelberg, *Aegypt. Randglossen*, p. 14.
[2] Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, p. 266.

The change of Sarai's name to Sarah (*v.* 15) was of course necessary to correspond to the change of the name of her husband. To account for the phraseology, we must suppose that what is now *v.* 6 lay before the writer already in a corrupted form. As for the name שרי, Ed. Meyer (p. 270) confidently thinks that Sarai represents the divine name Sharayat. A goddess so-called is mentioned in an inscription at Boṣra in the Hauran beside Dûshara or Dusares (cp. *ZATW* vi. 16). This, however, is in itself difficult and improbable, and it is better to see in Sarai an Arabising form of the Hebrew name Sarah. From our present point of view the root-letters שר would seem to belong to a N. Arabian ethnic, and it is no mere 'neckischer Zufall' (Meyer) that ששי and שרי stand together in the list of those who (temp. Ezra) put away their Arabian wives (Ezra x. 40), for ששי (see on Num. xiii. 22) is not derived from שׁשׁ, 'byssus,' any more than ששן (1 Chr. ii. 31) is derived from ששי, but comes from one of the most widely current of the popular corruptions of ישמע = ישמעאל (see on xiii. 11). How such a good scholar as Meyer can make such statements as occur in *Die Israeliten*, pp. 264, note 3, and 265, is not easy to say. That ששי and שרי stand together is a consequence of the close relations constantly maintained between Judah and N. Arabia. Both are Asshurite or Ishmaelite names.

In further support of this view I must not forget to quote the name שׂריה, which Nöldeke (*E. Bib.*, 'Names,' § 35) puts beside ישראל as meaning 'God contends,' but which, like other names of that type, is compounded of two much abbreviated names. Most probably שר = שור = אשור; cp. on 'Israel,' xxxii. 29, and note that David's scribe is called both Seraiah and Shavsha (2 S. viii. 17; 1 Chr. xviii. 16); 'Shavsha' represents Shamsha (= Ishmael), and so throws a light on Seraiah. יה has a similar meaning; it comes from יהו = יחו = ירחם.

The result is that Abraham as the Yarḥamite patriarch, and Sarai or Sarah as the Asshurite, correspond, and it will be noticed that Asshur and Yeraḥme'el together make up Asshur-Yeraḥme'el, the primitive home of the early heroes. The same may be said of Jacob

and Israel,[1] the one name being Yerahme'elite, the other Asshurite (cp. on xxxii. 29).

Singularly enough, there is no crisis in the life of the promised son which brings about a change of name. Was he too unimportant for this in the legendary tradition? The view is not unplausible; Isaac has not unfairly been styled 'Abraham's double.' More probably, however, the name Isaac remained because, unlike the names 'Abram' and 'Sarai,' it was given by a direct divine command. And what does 'Isaac' mean? Apparently 'one who laughs,' alluding (it might be) to some birth-story resembling that of Zoroaster—that the child laughed aloud as he came into the world.[2] Or we might consider that Isaac was originally a thunder-god, and compare the grim laughter spoken of in Ps. ii. 4. But surely it would be extremely odd if the name of any of the patriarchs had come down to us without corruption.[3] Must not יצחק, like the companion-names, be a worn-down form of the original name, and we may here derive a suggestion from Amos, in one of whose prophecies the 'high places of Isaac' and the 'sanctuaries of Israel' are unexpectedly parallel. How can we account for this? Why 'Isaac' rather than the seemingly more natural 'Jacob'? Surely there must lurk underneath יצחק a name of twofold significance—a name which denoted, not only a certain legendary personage, but also some part of that N. Arabian border-land with which all the three great patriarchs were traditionally connected. Now among the place-names which have been found to contain fragments of אשחר is דמשק (xiv. 15, xv. 2), where שק (like שך in משך, x. 2) represents the שח in אשחר; see especially Am. iii. 12, where the unintelligible ערש which follows דמשק (mispointed in MT.) is certainly a disguised אשר, *i.e.* the district called d-m-sh-ḳ is, according to this gloss, synonymous with Asshur (= Ashḥur). It is probable that יצחק (in Amos)

[1] Rob. Smith (*Kinship*[2], p. 34, note 1) regards Abraham as = Judah, and Sarah as = Israel.

[2] De Harlez, *Avesta*, introd. p. xxv; A. V. Williams Jackson, *Zoroaster the Prophet of Ancient Iran* (1899), p. 27, where ample references are given, *e.g.* Dinkart, vii. 3, 2 and 25; Plin. *HN* vii. 16, 15.

[3] It is not enough to suppose with Ed. Meyer (*ZATW* vi. 7) that the original form was Yiṣḥaḳel.

is a more correct form than יצחק, and that ישח or ישק has come from אשחר,[1] the remaining letter ק or ח being an expansion such as we sometimes find in by-forms of proper names. The same origin may be assigned to עשק, a place-name in the Isaac-story (xxvi. 20), and to the Naphtalite name יחצאל (xlvi. 24).

There are still some textual corrections which call for mention. That יליד is often a corruption of some shorter form of ירחמאל, has been pointed out already. See on xiv. 14, and note that in Jer. ii. 16 sound method requires us to read הֲעֲרָב ישראל [לי] אם בית ירחמאל הוא, 'Is Israel (as) Arabia unto me? is he (as) the house of Yerahme'el'? יליד (יריל) and בית were transposed for an evident reason, and so too in Gen. xvii. 12, 13, 23, יליד בית, יליד ביתך, and יליד[ו] בית[ו] represent בית ירחמ'. Observe, too, that there is a parallel phrase indicating that by those who come of the 'house of Yerahme'el' the narrator means us to understand 'purchased slaves' (see on xii. 16, assuming that the country where Abram sojourned was Miṣrim, not Miṣraim). One of the two parallel phrases is probably a gloss.

With regard to other supposed circumcision-legends, see on Ex. iv. 18-26, Josh. v. 2 *ff.* For ethnological illustrations I see that Driver and H. P. Smith have already referred to Spencer and Gillen's *Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899). See, further, on xxiv. 2, 9, and *E. Bib.*, 'Circumcision.'

[1] Cp. ספר הישר (Josh. x. 13, etc.), and ישוחיה (following יעקבה) in 1 Chr. iv. 36, where ישר and ישוח may both reasonably be traced to אשר or אשחור.

ABRAHAM'S HOSPITALITY (GEN. XVIII. 1-15)

ABRAHAM gives hospitality to three wayfaring men. Who they were he knew not. They were, however, messengers from the higher world; or rather, if we rightly interpret the meaning of the present narrator, two were messengers, and the third was Yahweh himself.[1] Abraham is here depicted as an ideal host (cp. xix. 2, 3). Addressing himself to the chief of the three, he sues for the privilege of entertaining them. There was much to give an edge to his curiosity, for the 'men' had, as it were, dropped upon him from the clouds. But neither at the opening of the meal (which was worthy of so rich a host and such distinguished guests) nor afterwards did he allow himself to ask questions. It is rather the strangers who permit themselves to do so. His wife Sarah was not in attendance; she was in her tent (cp. xxiv. 67). The reward of such hospitality must therefore be notified to Abraham in her absence. It is presumably the leader of the party who does this, not, in the original story, in his own name alone. To this Abraham listens in reverent silence. We may compare the story of the announcement of the birth of Samson, where Manoah's wife, who was its privileged hearer, thus describes the event to her husband, 'A man of God came to me; his countenance was like that of Mal'ak-Elohim, very terrible; but I asked him not whence he was, nor told he me his name' (Judg. xiii. 6). We may ask therefore, Did Abraham, as the words fell from the Speaker's lips, guess who he was, viz. at the least 'a man of God,' but

[1] Eusebius (*Onom. Sacra*, 210, 70-72) calls them angels, and says that they were *worshipped* by the heathen. Cp. Meyer, *Die Israel.* p. 263.

not impossibly Mal'ak-Elohim himself?[1] The point is left undetermined. Sarah, at any rate, gives occasion to the Speaker to show that he is a 'searcher of the heart.' She laughs incredulously within herself, and when reproved, timidly denies the fact. But the great Being, who is so thoroughly human (see pp. 7, 15), and yet so free from human limitations, insists that she did laugh (*vv.* 12-15).

In the present form of the story the bright appearance of the three 'men' is so veiled that at first they are not recognised as divine. In its earlier form the recognition of their true character may have been more complete. The number three would of itself suggest to Abraham the greatest possibilities, and their majestic bearing must soon (cp. Judg. xiii. 6) have produced certainty. Men they were indeed, but god-men; in short, the members of that supreme council of Elohim of which Yahweh was the president and director.[2] For the divine viceroy of earth, best known as Mal'ak-Yahweh, was not always the sole revealer or performer of the purpose of the Heavenly Ones concerning human beings. The divine triad sometimes willed to make a tour of inspection together (cp. Gen. xi. 7).

The same germs which produced the beautiful story of the Divine Visit to Abraham developed in a similar way elsewhere. We have already called to mind the journey of the divine Ennead related by an Egyptian tale-writer, which issued in a beneficent act to a lonely man (see p. 74). Similar things are also said of divine triads. Thus, in the Edda, Odinn, Hænir, and Loki go about in company; and Ovid[3] has retold the myth of Hyrieus, a man of Tanagra in Bœotia, who entertained Zeus, Poseidon, and Hermes, *i.e.*, according to Jensen,[4] Bel, Ea, and two messengers, and whose wish for a son in his old age was gratified by the gods. The story of Philemon and Baucis[5] may also be referred to, though it is, of course, most parallel to the

[1] See on xvi. 7, where it is shown that Mal'ak is an edifying transformation of Yeraḥme'el.

[2] Cp. Isa. vi. 8, and see p. 15.

[3] *Fasti*, v. 495-540; cp. Stucken, *Astralmythen*, pp. 211 *f.*

[4] *Das Gilg.-Epos*, p. 307, note 2.

[5] Ovid, *Met.* vii. 626-721.

story of Lot. There may have been many such tales of journeying deities in N. Arabia and Palestine, though the only one that has come down to us in some fulness (xi. 1-9 having been cut down) is xviii. 1-15. The affinity of the story to tales of the Dioscuri has been pointed out by Stucken (*Astralmythen*, pp. 83, 211) and Rendel Harris (*Cult of the Heavenly Twins*).

That in the original story three *gods* must have been spoken of, is convincingly shown by Gunkel, but who the three gods were, this able critic does not tell us. Presumably, however, they were not Yahweh and the Kabiri (as Dr. Rendel Harris supposes),[1] but Yahweh, Asshur (or Ashtar), and Yerahme'el[2] (see p. 16). The two latter appear to have been often viewed as united (see on xvi. 13 *b*), just as Yahweh was popularly viewed as united to Yerahme'el. Later Jewish teachers, however, supposed that the 'three men' were three angels, Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael.[3] This was in accordance with their fundamental theory respecting Michael, who was the chief link between a transcendent deity and the world of men. They were really not so far wrong, if מיכאל is virtually a substitute for [יהוה] מלאך, and if both מיכאל and מלאך are transformations of the N. Arabian divine name ירחמאל, and the great Being whom they both represent is an honourably degraded deity. When, however, this story was originally written, Yerahme'el was a true and full divinity, second only to Yahweh. It was one of the writers symbolised as J who converted the three divinities of the original story into three messengers, a step which was doubtless approved

[1] See the above-mentioned works. Surely Yahweh and the Kabir (in Phœnician mythology) would make a company of eight.

[2] To suppose that in the earliest form of the story the company consisted of the Babylonian gods Bel and Ea and two messengers (Gilgamesh and the pilot of the ship of the deluge) is too hazardous for me, but not for Jensen (*Das Gilg.-Epos*, p. 307, note 2).

[3] *Bereshith rabba*, par. 48; cp. *Yoma*, 37 *a*. The old mosaics in Sta. Maria Maggiore at Rome, according to O. Richter, represented Abraham as visited by the Logos and two attendant angels. The historical connexion between the Logos and the divine Being Yerahme'el (John i. 1, etc., Prov. viii. 22-31), and between the Logos and the Messiah and Michael (Rev. xix. 13, 15 *f.*, xii. 7), is clear (see p. 60, with note 4).

by the religious authorities, and is parallel to the conversion of 'Yerahme'el-Yahweh' into 'Mal'ak-Yahweh,' *i.e.* 'Yahweh's messenger.' To a later writer, however, who must also be symbolised as J, this did not appear the best mode of representation. According to him, one of the three was Yahweh; the other two, who went on to Sodom, were messengers.[1] This is the view expressed in xviii. 17-19, 22 *b*-33 *a*. Hence 'the men' in *v.* 22 *a* came to mean 'the two men,' whereas originally it meant 'the three men.' A redactor made still further changes, turning the plural in *vv.* 3, 10, 13, 14, into the singular, and inserting יהוה (xviii. 1, 13); 𝔊 also reads *καὶ εἶπεν* in *v.* 5. For a fuller sketch of the various literary phases, see Gunkel's commentary, and for a different view Stade, *Alttest. Theol.* i. 98. Neither Stade nor Gunkel, however, points out that שני in xix. 1 (see below) records an earlier reading of the highest importance.

Three or four points have yet to be mentioned. The simplest is in *v.* 3, where read אֲדֹנָי with Dillmann. Simple, too, is that in *v.* 1, where the MT. states that the theophany was 'by the terebinths (or sacred trees) of Mamre,' but where 𝔊 (*πρὸς τῇ δρυί*) presupposes, not אלני, but אלון (cp. xii. 6). As *v.* 4 shows, 𝔊's reading is correct.[2] It was the sacred, and perhaps originally oracular tree (cp. Judg. iv. 4, 5), near which Abraham dwelt. The third point is that the second visit to Abraham, announced in xviii. 10, 14, is not recorded. And the fourth is that the story of the promise of a son to Abraham and that of the destruction of Sodom were originally independent. They were brought together by J, who, with artistic economy, made a single visit of the Heavenly Ones suffice for a twofold object.

[1] Sievers, who claims to have separated quite smoothly a Yahweh-version of the story from a Three-men-version, seems to me to have used a wrong clue.

[2] Similarly in xiii. 18, xiv. 13, Dt. xi. 30. See Wellhausen in Bleek's *Einleitung*,[(4)] p. 643.

ABRAHAM'S INTERCESSION (GEN. XVIII. 16-33)

A LINKING passage. Originally it consisted of *vv.* 16, 20-22. Later on, a deepening interest in the general religious problem of the suffering righteous prompted the inserted verses, the style and phraseology of which remind us of Deuteronomy. The writer had the feeling that Yahweh could not have withheld his intention from his friend Abraham, to whom he had already promised such a great future. So the patriarch drew near, and began to plead for guilty Sodom. He would not palliate its offences, but might there not be some righteous men even in Sodom? It would surely be unjust to destroy the righteous with the wicked. Again and again he renewed his pleading, and obtained a promise that even ten righteous men should be enough to save the city. Jensen's view that the intercession is really a reflexion of Ea's intercession with Bel in the Babylonian deluge-story (*Gilg.-Epos*, p. 300) is far-fetched. As to textual errors, 'I will go down,' etc. (*v.* 21), may be put down to the redactor; the original text may have had 'let us go down' (cp. xi. 7). Also, with Wellh., Ball, Holz., and Gunkel, we should probably adopt the old Jewish reading, 'ויהוה עוד עמד לפני אבר' (*v.* 22 *b*). The words were probably altered out of reverence, because 'standing before any one' might be taken to mean 'serving him.'

LOT SAVED (GEN. XIX. 1-28)

LOT, like Abraham, proves the reality of his religion by his scrupulous regard to hospitality. (Abraham and Loṭ—were they not the Hebrew Dioscuri, who were specially the guardians of hospitality?) But Loṭ is worse off than Abraham; the common feeling of his city is against him. Indeed, not only the inhabitants of Sodom but all the Ashḥurites (see below) give hateful proof of their solidarity in wickedness. All that remains is for the divine ones to save Loṭ and his relatives from the impending catastrophe. At daybreak, then, Loṭ, being warned, leaves the city, but only his two daughters can be induced to follow him. The divine ones (who have been converted into 'messengers') urge them to hurry, but Loṭ, who is fearful of destruction, obtains permission to take refuge in the city of Zoar (so called, from the terms in which Loṭ framed his petition). After sunrise the blow falls on the guilty city and its neighbourhood.

The text of this section is specially corrupt. Apart from the ordinary sources of corruption, the deep interest of the subject for later ages naturally led to alterations. Not only have the original 'three men' become 'the (two) messengers,' but it is probable that the references to Loṭ's wife (xix. 15 *f.*, 26; contrast *v.* 12) and the whole of the Zoar-episode are subsequent insertions. The traditional view of the text of these supposed references needs a close examination. And as to the Zoar-episode, most probably it is no part of the original story, but was inserted, not to account for the escape of a single fruitful piece of land, but to justify the popular etymology of the name 'Zoar.' To these points, however, we shall return presently.

The main body of narrative relates the awful judicial catastrophe which befell Sodom (*v.* 13), or, as elsewhere stated (*vv.* 24, 28; cp. xviii. 20, xiii. 10), Sodom and Gomorrah. The description of the phenomena has given rise to various scientific hypotheses, as, for instance, that the calamity began with an earthquake, continued with furious eruptions, and ended with the submerging of the destroyed cities by the waters of the Dead Sea.[1] Against this, however, we must urge, with Prof. Lucien Gautier, that 'the text of Genesis speaks of a rain of fire and brimstone, and a pillar of smoke rising to heaven, but neither of an earthquake, nor of an igneous eruption, nor of an inundation.'[2]

But the particular details of the catastrophe are of comparatively little importance. The essence of the story does not even lie in the view that the calamity referred to was a fire-deluge (or, as Stucken calls it, a dry deluge), as opposed to the water-deluge that preceded it. What is primarily meant is that another age of the earth's history (*i.e.* strictly, of N. Arabian history) came to an end by a supernatural agency, and that that history had to make a fresh start. In Peruvian folklore, it is true, we find the fire-deluge brought pretty close up to the water-deluge. This, however, is not the most thoughtful view, considering what we have found in the case of the deluge. It is, in fact, a waste of catastrophic energy to bring the two great similar events too near one another. Nothing but the experience of the faultiness of the present human race could adequately justify a fresh destruction such as that which has attached itself to the names of Sodom and Gomorrah, and which originally must have been localised in the region of the myth-framers or myth-adapters, viz. the region of Yerahme'el or N. Arabia.

Local stories of this kind are extremely common. They are probably weakened versions of stories of a larger scope. They have, however, retained that didactic element which must very early have infused itself into such stories. It was held that in course of time the corruption of the race, or of the population of some particular district, reached so

[1] See Blanckenhorn, *ZDPV* xix. 1-59 (1896), xxi. 65-83 (1898).
[2] *E. Bib.*, 'Dead Sea,' § 7.

great a height that a portentous judgment had to take place.[1] In Arabia the ruined cities or villages of such impious populations are called *maḳlūbāt*, 'overturned ones,' which is parallel to the technical term *mahpēkāh*, 'overturning,' used of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah in the O.T.[2] E. H. Palmer[3] refers to the great stones at the base and on the summit of Jebel Madara, which are said to have been rained down from heaven to destroy an inhospitable folk. The traces of a deluge-myth in Arabia are, in fact, but few. And yet there is no reason which absolutely prohibits the view that N. Arabia had a true deluge-myth of its own, and that such a myth underlies the present story of Sodom. Certainly the occurrence of הפך in xix. 25, 29, is not in this way prohibitive, for this verb can be used with much laxity (see Job xii. 15).

Before proceeding further, let it be remarked that the story of Sodom is plainly a N. Arabian one. We may infer this, not only from its coming after stories already proved to be Yeraḥme'elite, but from the impossibility of explaining certain doubtful names and phrases except upon this hypothesis. Note especially the gloss on אנשי סדם in xix. 4, and the most probable form of the account of the judgment in *v.* 24. סדם has already been explained (see on xiv. 2); most probably it comes from חסרם, *i.e.* אַשְׁחַר אֲרָם. Similarly עמרה, like רעמה in x. 7, comes from ארם (= ירחמאל) with the feminine termination. It is just possible, indeed, that the so-called Gomorrah (γομορρα) may be a legendary double of 'Sodom.' But, however this may be, it will be seen from the criticism of an earlier passage (xiii. 10) that the region supposed to be destroyed by the calamity was located, not beside the Dead Sea, but in the southern border-land, possibly not far from the region in which early tradition placed the land of Eden. Moreover, in dealing

[1] See Cheyne, *New World*, June 1892, pp. 236-245.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Sodom,' § 4. On the phrase מהפכת אלהים, see Wellh. on Am. iv. 11, who remarks that אלהים indicates a non-Israelitish origin for the legend. This, however, is only half the truth. The other half is that אלהים in this phrase has come from ירחמאל (cp. p. 69); that is, the original story of Sodom gave the divine Judge the name Yeraḥme'el.

[3] *Desert of the Exodus*, p. 416.

with the deluge-story in chaps. vi.-viii. we have found reason to hold that an early form of that tradition represented the deluge as overwhelming Yeraḥme'elite Arabia, and the ark as settling on the mountain of Ashtar (cp. on Dt. iii. 17). It now becomes natural to conjecture that the original story of the calamity of Sodom was one form of the Yeraḥme'elite deluge-story. And the conjecture is confirmed by the discovery of a series of parallelisms between the Hebrew and Babylonian deluge-stories on the one hand and the narrative in Gen. xix. (revised text) on the other. Here is the list; it should be added that Jastrow too (*RBA* 507) has noticed the parallelism between the story of Sodom and that of the deluge.

A	B
1. The righteous man 'Noaḥ' (vi. 9), or rather Ḥanôk, or, as the great Babylonian story said, Ut-napištim.	1. The righteous man, Loṭ (xix. 1-8).
2. Vexation of Yahweh (vi. 6). Anger of the divinity against the Babylonian city of Šurippak.	2. Anger of the Elohim against the city of Sodom, or Ḥašram (xix.).
3. 'All flesh' had become corrupt (vi. 11-13). The city of Šurippak was *lābīr*, *i.e.* 'impure' (Babylonian story, Zimmern, line 14, if the emendation is correct).	3. The culminating act of wickedness (xix. 4-11).
4. The divine revelation to 'Noaḥ' (vi. 13 *ff.*). Ea's message to Ut-napištim.	4. The divine revelation to Loṭ (xix. 13; cp. xviii. 20 *f.*).
5. A long-continued, destructive rain-storm (vii. 10-12, 17 *ff.*) on Yeraḥme'elite Arabia (vii. 4). A similar storm on the city of Šurippak.[1]	5. A long-continued, destructive rain-storm (vii. 10-12, 17 *ff.*), on the cities of the whole of Yeraḥme'el (xix. 24 *f.*).

[1] It is assumed here that a tradition of a storm which overwhelmed Šurippak has been fused with the tradition of a far larger flood in the deluge-story of the Gilgameš epic (see Jastrow, *Rel. of Bab. and Ass.* p. 507, and cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Deluge,' § 22). It is not asserted that even the former tradition is historical, nor denied that the deluge-myth in its earliest form—earlier than the earliest known Babylonian or Yeraḥme'elite myth or legend—related to the whole earth.

6. 'Noaḥ' and his family delivered (vi. 13, 23 *b*); also of Ut-napištim and his household.	6. Loṭ and his family delivered (xix. 15 *ff.*).
7. The ark grounds on the mountain of Ashtar (viii. 4). The ship grounds on the mountain of Niṣir.	7. Loṭ warned to escape to the mountains [of Yeraḥme'el] (xix. 17).

It will be noticed that under B 4 a reference has been given to a passage in the account of the visit of the 'three men,' *i.e.* the three Elohim, to Abraham (xviii. 20 *f.*). The reason is that the statement relative to the investigation of Sodom's crimes is practically equivalent to a revelation of the judgment upon the city and neighbourhood. That the matter should be disclosed to Abraham suggests a minor question which for completeness' sake I have to raise, viz. whether there may not have been another version of the deluge-story (I assume that the judgment on Sodom was originally of water, and not of fire), according to which Abraham, and not Ḥanok or Loṭ, was the name of the righteous man whom the Elohim delivered. I may also refer to the significant parallelism between 'Elohim remembered Noaḥ' (viii. 5) and 'Elohim remembered Abraham' (xix. 29). The theory here suggested is that when redactors adapted or harmonised the story of Sodom, they left these two indications that the story had once had a different form, in which Abraham was the name of the representative of the second human race. And since Abraham now becomes identical with Noaḥ or Ḥanok, we may perhaps consider 'Abraham' (Arab-Yeraḥme'el) to have been originally a cognomen or title of the man to whom deliverance was vouchsafed. However this may be, the original story simply related that a single righteous man, with his family, received timely warning that those among whom he sojourned had displeased Yahweh by a gross violation of his laws,[1] and that Elohim saved him from destruction. For a violent rain-storm arose, submerging the whole of the guilty land of

[1] Cp. Ezek. xvi. 49 *f.* It is not improbable that Asmodæus (Ashmedai), the lustful demon in Tobit, derives his name from 'Sĕdōm' (Sodom); the corrupt reading 'Sĕdōm' had no doubt already arisen. Cp. Lilith, the name of the female counterpart of Ashmedai, which may ultimately come from Yeraḥme'elith.

Yerahme'elite Arabia. Such was probably the earliest form of the 'Sodom'-story.

The original story, however, underwent various modifications. Lōṭ, the son of Haran (*i.e.* Ḥaran), otherwise called Lōṭan, son of Seir the Ḥorite—in either case an Ashḥurite (see on xi. 31)—was substituted for Abraham, and a floating story of mythic origin, but in an altered form, was attached to the story of Lōṭ, to explain and justify the wrath of the Elohim. After this a legend was inserted to account for the name Zoar. Lōṭ had taken refuge there, by permission of the Elohim, because it was a 'little' city. Lastly, corruption in the text of xix. 24 suggested that the scene of the traditional story must have been in that 'awful hollow,' that 'bit of the infernal regions come to the surface' which was at the southern end of the Dead Sea. And a fragment of the formations of rock-salt at Jebel Usdum, to which a myth like that of Niobe may already have become attached, was, naturally enough, transferred to the altered legend, and identified with Lōṭ's wife; the 'looking behind' ascribed to the latter was also in full accordance with mythology, and fitted in with the strange-looking 'pillar of salt.'[1] So urgently necessary is it to examine the textual basis of ingenious and attractive mythological theories.

Let us now turn to passages which in their corrected form are important for the theory of the narrative which appears to me the most probable. Much of the text is sound, but there are some very suspicious words and groups of words.

(*a*) First, as to 'the two messengers' in xix. 1. As soon as we grant that *v.* 1 is the continuation of xviii. 22 *a*, we see that the original subject of the verb (ויבאו) must have been האנשים. Dillmann thinks that a later writer substituted המלאכים for clearness, but does not account for the prefixed שְׁנֵי. Why should the narrator say either 'the two men' or 'the two angels'? His view evidently was that one of the three men was Yahweh, and that the other

[1] On the affinities of the story see Peters, *Early Hebrew Story*, pp. 145 *f.*; E. H. Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, ii. 478 *ff.*; W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.*(2) p. 88, note 2; and especially Stucken, *Astralmythen*, pp. 83, 110, 231, 240, 388.

two were angels. To say that the two angels came to Sodom is confusing; it might conceivably suggest that there had originally been more than two angels. Positiveness is in this case fully justified; שני is a piece of an indistinct [ה]אנשים. When in all good faith שני had been wrongly read, it became natural 'for clearness' to read המלאכי.

(*b*) Next, as to כל העם מקצה (*v.* 4). Is it likely that, as *BDB* affirm, קצה is 'a condensed term for what is included between extremities = the whole'? *E.g.*, can מק' אחיו, xlvii. 2, mean 'from the entirety of his brethren,' even if we venture further to say that the sense is suitable? In Jer. li. 31 can עירו מקצה be rendered 'the city as a whole'? In Isa. lvi. 11 can מקצהו, literally 'from its end,' mean 'from its whole,' and can this be = 'in a body'? The same doubt applies to מקצות העם, 1 K. xii. 31, xiii. 33, and to מקצותם, Judg. xviii. 2, 2 K. xvii. 32, where *BDB* explain מק' 'from the whole of.' In accordance with corrections elsewhere, it is best to read כל-עם אשחר, 'all the people of Ashḥur' (omitting the second מ as dittographed). This may be a gloss on אנשי סדם, for סדם (see above) = Ashḥur-Aram. The place meant is the capital of a district in Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el. Cp. *v.* 24 (revised text), where the devastated region is called 'Asshur' or 'Ashḥur.'

(*c*) Of גש-הלאה in *v.* 9 *BDB* say, 'literally, approach thither, *i.e.* move away.' This may be theoretically possible, but is not probable. Now it so happens that הלאה in MT. is often corrupt (see *e.g.* on xxxv. 21, 1 S. x. 3, Am. v. 27); probably it is so here, as indeed the warning Paseḳ before גש-הל' suggests, and comes from ירחמאל. The second ויאמרו is equally suspicious. I have found cases in which this word too must have come from ירחמאל. I can see no difficulty in supposing that ויא' represents a ירח' which was a correction of the impossible הלאה. Not impossibly too, האחד has been produced out of an ill-written אשחר; but more probably the copy before the scribe had אחרהאחד, and the first three letters fell out through their close resemblance to what followed. Lastly, as to גש. Why may it not, like שני in *v.* 1, come from אנשי? The result is that it is best to read ויאמרו אנשי ירחמאל אשחר האחד וגו',

'and the men of Yerahme'el-Ashhur said, The single one (there),' etc. The phrase 'the men of Yer.-Ashhur' is synonymous with 'the men of Sodom'; see on מקצה, *v.* 4.

(*d*) In *v.* 15 המלאכים is really inconsistent with האנשים in *v.* 16. For the latter implies that the persons spoken of were divine.

(*e*) In *v.* 16, why has no one pointed out the unsuitableness of ויתמהמה after ויאיצו? 'As the morning-grey appeared, they pressed Loṭ, saying, Rise, take thy wife, and thy two daughters who are here, lest thou perish by the guilt of the city; and the men seized him by the hand,' etc. After what is said in *v.* 14 how could Loṭ have dawdled? Note the warning Pasek after וית׳, and read (following the precedent of the correction of התמ׳ in Judg. iii. 26) ירחמאלים, a gloss on העיר (*v.* 15). Is a confirmation of this wanted? It is found in the parenthesis בחמלת י׳ עליו. It is true, these words are quite susceptible of exegesis. They may be meant to convey the impression that the destroyers were but messengers of Yahweh, and that the ministers had to be urgent because Yahweh would be displeased if anything happened to Loṭ. But is this satisfactory? One would gladly be without the interruption, and who needed to be told that Yahweh showed clemency to Loṭ? Experience elsewhere suggests as the original ירחמאלים written twice over (in the first, ר corresponds to MT.'s ב; in the second, to ו). A gloss on עיר.

(*f*) How comes it that the city is called in *v.* 22, not מצער, but צוער? The fact is troublesome, especially when we notice that both הוא מצער and הלא מ׳ הוא (*v.* 20) have the appearance of glosses. It would seem that the author of these glosses read the name of Loṭ's city of refuge as מצער. But, if so, what geographical or ethnographical connexion has this name? And may we infer that wherever the name צער or צוער occurs, it is to be regarded as a popular distortion of מצער? The truth may be that the only accurate form of the name of the city is מִצוֹר, but that (as in Ps. lxxxiii. 8, lxxxvii. 5) this was often shortened into צור, and that this again was popularly expanded into צוער. An early scribe who knew this wrote twice over the marginal corrections 'that is, מצער,' and 'is it not (rather)

מצער?' It so happens that הר מצער occurs in Ps. xlii. 7, where (though another view may be possible) it is probably a gloss on ארץ ירדן והרמונים, or rather ארץ ירחון חרמון, where the stream Yarḥon and the mountain Hermon (from רחם = ירחמ'), are in the N. Arabian border-land.

(*g*) Our next question is difficult alike to ask and to answer. Are the critics of to-day satisfied with the usual interpretation of *v.* 24? 'Yahweh had caused to rain . . . from Yahweh out of heaven.' Can יהוה have two meanings in the same sentence, (1) the God who avenges his broken moral laws, and (2) heaven (see Hommel, *Gr.* p. 177, note 4), as the source of meteorological phenomena? Upon this theory we must at any rate delete מן־השמים, as a prosaic, even if correct gloss. It is improbable, however, that יהוה can mean 'heaven' or even 'the heaven-god.' Ewald (*Gesch.* ii. 223) compares for the latter meaning Mic. v. 6, but there 'dew from Yahweh' does not mean 'dew from heaven,' but 'dew which from its preciousness is to be accounted a special gift from God.' Consequently we are led to doubt whether the reading מאת יהוה is correct. The first יהוה may stand; it is not likely that it has been substituted by J for 'the men.' 'Yahweh' may be mentioned as the leader and director of the divine triad (= 'the men').

(*h*) 'Caused to rain brimstone and fire.' Is this right? In *v.* 25 it is said that Yahweh 'overturned' all that region. The word does not accord with brimstone and fire, but does suit water as the destroying agent (cp. Job xii. 15, and Duhm's note). May not one therefore apply methodical criticism to the text? Taking this course, I have been led to this result—ויהוה המטיר על־סדם ועל־עמרה [עֲמֹרַת ואַשֻּׁר] מֵאַת יום מן־השמים, 'and Yahweh had caused it to rain on Sodom and on Gomorrah [Gomorrah and Asshur] a hundred days from heaven.' גפרית may come from עמרת (cp. 𝔊's Γομορρα); so גפר from גמר, vi. 14 (see note); אש, as in אשכנז, and like איש in ix. 20, etc., from אַשֻּׁר; יהוה (second time) from יה, and this from ים (= יום, as in Phœnician). The plausibility of the view that the Sodom-story is really another version of the N. Arabian deluge-story has been shown already (see introd.).

(*i*) *V.* 25 is but slightly more defensible. 'Those cities,

and the whole *kikkar*, and all the inhabitants of the cities'—can this be called good Hebrew style? The gloss-theory may, of course, be applied, but not to the text in its present form. Experience, however, will at once suggest a remedy. האל (like אלה, see on Isa. x. 10) is a possible corruption of ירחמאל, and ישבי (see on iv. 20) of ישמעאל. There remains הערים. Not unfrequently ערים proves to be a corruption, most commonly perhaps of ערבים. It is very possible, however, that the final ם has arisen through a wrongly affixed sign of abbreviation (הערי׳), and that an earlier reading was אחרי. Now אחרי and אחר often represent אשחור and אשחֵר respectively. Thus we get ויהפך את־אשחור־ירחמאל ואת כל־הככר [ואת כל־ישמעאל־אשחור], 'And he overturned Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el and the whole *kikkar*,' to which is added, as a gloss on 'the whole *kikkar*,' 'all Ishmael-Ashḥur.' Ishmael- or Yeraḥme'el-Ashḥur was, of course, the name both of a region and of a city, just as Miṣṣōr, though generally the name of a region, can also be (see on *v.* 20) that of a city.

(*k*) And now as to the very brief record of the fate of Loṭ's wife (*v.* 26). The Hebrew is unexceptionable. It is certain, too, that Wisd. x. 7 speaks of a *στήλη ἁλός* as, together with the 'smoking waste,' etc., still existing in the writer's day (cp. also Jos. *Ant.* i. 11, 4). Neither argument, however, proves the correctness of the text. It is no doubt conceivable that the insertion of this episode was made subsequently to the alteration of torrential rain into showers of sulphur and fire, but reason has to be shown why we should not, as in the case of *v.* 25, seek for an underlying text. A reference to local formations of rock-salt is only plausible at a first glance. Nothing is said about these elsewhere, and if such a phenomenon as a Loṭ's wife in salt were mentioned, surely it would have been added, 'behold, it is hard by the sea of salt (?) unto this day.' Lastly, both נעיב and מלח elsewhere are corruptions, the one of צבעון (so Josh. xv. 43, 1 S. x. 5 [נצבי], xiii. 3 *f.*; cp. on xxxvi. 24), the other of ירחמאל (see on xiv. 3). Nor is this all that is suspicious. מאחריו is usually explained 'from following him,' but if the general view implied by the text is correct, we ought rather to read אחריה (see *v.* 17);

I do not say that this is correct, but that we ought to look underneath the suspicious words, among which I fear I must include אשתו, for it appears from *vv.* 12 and 14 (cp. *v.* 31, 'our father is old') that Loṭ's wife was already dead; read probably, עשתור. And now, since all the rest is fading away, we must also look beneath ותבט and ותהי, which in themselves are unsuspicious, but are not therefore correct. The one may have come from וְתֹעֵבַת, the other from הוא. Thus we get ותעבת עשתור ירח׳ הוא צבעון ירח׳, 'and the abomination of Ashtor-Yeraḥme'el, that is, Ṣibeʿon-Yeraḥme'el.' It would almost seem that Ashtor-Yeraḥme'el and Ṣibeʿon-Yeraḥme'el were two names of the same place (see on Dt. i. 4), where was a sanctuary with a noted idolatrous symbol of the N. Arabian deity. The passage thus read will probably be a later interpolation suggested by the words 'and he overturned Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el' (Ashḥur and Ashtor, though different forms, have the same meaning). The mistake אשתו, for אשתו׳ or עשתו׳, may have led to the interpolated references to Loṭ's wife in *vv.* 15 and 16.

ORIGIN OF MOAB AND AMMON (GEN. XIX. 30-38)

THE legend of the origin of the two kindred peoples, Moab and Ammon, and of their respective names. It traces their existence to the marriage connexion of Loṭ's two daughters with their father, and it accounts for the names 'Moab' and 'Ammon' by an etymological play suggested by the preceding story. It was formerly held that the legend was the expression of Israel's hatred and moral contempt for its troublesome neighbours; that Israel,

while admitting its connexion with Loṭ and therefore with Abraham, ascribed it to a grossly incestuous act, for which Ed. Böhmer[1] found a parallel in the tracing of the line of Judah's kings to a primitive incestuous connexion between the patriarch Judah and Tamar his daughter-in-law (see Gen. xxxviii.). The explanation, however, is in both cases incorrect. Ancient legend-makers do not pronounce judgment upon acts which a later age called incestuous in the pointed way supposed by the older commentaries (see on xxxviii., xlix. 4). The story of the relations between Judah and Tamar is probably a figurative recital of the growth of clans, the form of which is partly suggested by a myth analogous to that of Tamûz and Ishtar,[2] and the tale of the connexion between Loṭ and his two daughters has arisen out of the view that Loṭ was the second founder of the human race (*i.e.* virtually, the Yeraḥme'elite people), just as the representation that Sarai was Abram's sister may have sprung from the by no means absurd notion that Abram was the first man of the Yeraḥme'elites. In neither narrative is any blame pronounced upon the actors in the drama. Tamar is expressly credited with 'righteousness,' and one's natural impression on reading *vv.* 31, 32, 36 is that those who told the legend had a feeling of pride in Loṭ's bold, resourceful daughters.[3] The view of Stucken[4] that the story immediately before us is a late transformation of a highly archaic detail of a creation-myth is too difficult to be considered here in passing.

The story fits in very well with the myth of the destruction of Sodom. Like the survivors from the deluge in the original story,[5] the survivors from the catastrophe of Sodom had no sons. Loṭ must therefore have left Zoar, which seemed too near the destroyed region to be quite safe. A cave in the mountains had to be his home, and since there were 'no men in the land' (*i.e.* in the higher regions of that part of the land of Yeraḥme'el) as husbands for women who

[1] *Das erste Buch der Tora*, Halle, 1862.

[2] 'Tamar,' as we shall see, has been produced out of 'Râmîth' or 'Rammîth,' *i.e.* the great Yeraḥme'elite goddess.

[3] See Gunkel's exposition.

[4] *Astralmythen*, p. 223, note.

[5] *Ibid.*

had lost their bridegrooms, no other course was open to Loṭ's daughters than that which they adopted.

It is very possible, however, that the Loṭ who was the traditional father[1] of Moab and Ammon belonged to a different cycle of legend from that which included the Sodom-story. Elsewhere[2] I have ventured to call him 'the primary Loṭ,' who would be identical with Loṭan, the eldest of the sons of Seir the Ḥorite (see on xxxvi. 20); possibly, indeed, the phrase 'the Ḥorite' (misinterpreted 'the cave-dweller') may have helped to suggest the detail about the 'cave.' However this may be, a confusion between the two Loṭs was as natural as that between the two Noaḥs, one of whom, it is true, arose by a scribe's error out of Ḥanôk. One may add that the drunkenness of Loṭ is curiously parallel to that of Noaḥ (ix. 21), except that it is not made clear how Loṭ obtained the wine.

Let us proceed to textual matters. (*a*) It can hardly be doubted that *v.* 30 has undergone redactorial manipulation. 'Dwelt in the mountains' and 'dwelt in a (the) cave' can hardly both be correct. The latter may be a gloss. And observe (*b*) that in *v.* 37 𝔊 inserts λέγουσα ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μου, presupposing מאב (as in Mesha's inscription). So much is right here that the name really is compounded of [ו]מ and אב, and should be grouped with names in which אב or אבי is an element. To explain with Hommel (*Verhandl. des XIII. Internat. Orient. Kongresses*, 1902; *Grundriss*, p. 164), 'his mother is the father' (*i.e.* that the father is unknown or not to be mentioned), is as improbable as explaining אחיאם 'mother's brother,' אחומי 'my mother's brother,' אחאב 'father's brother.'[3] I have to the best of my ability shown that אב or אבי as an element in names represents ערב, 'Arabia'; analogous to this is אח or אחו or אחי from אשחור 'Ashḥur,' and אם or עם or אמו from ארם or עמר (cp. עמרה). The same key must be applied to get the original meaning of not a few personal names preserved in

[1] The phrase *benê Loṭ* only occurs in Dt. ii. 9, Ps. lxxxiii. 9, and perhaps in the true text of Isa. xxv. 7 (see *Crit. Bib.*).

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Lot.'

[3] For the underlying theory, see *E. Bib.*, 'Abi, names with,' and cp. S. A. Cook, in W. R. Smith, *Kinship*, p. 185, note 1.

N. Semitic inscriptions. Thus Ummu-abîa and Abi-ummi (Johns, *Deeds*, iii. pp. 528, 554) spring from corrupt forms of the Canaanitish 'Yeraḥme'el' and 'Arâb.' So, too, Ištar-ummi (Jastrow, Germ. ed., i. 160, note 2) and the Phœnician אמעשתרת[1] and אמאשמן come from forms of 'Aram' and 'Ashtar,' 'Aram' and 'Ishmael,' respectively. How these names were explained under the influence of a long-continued religious conventionalising tendency can sometimes, not always, be conjectured. See, further, on אברהם, xvii. 5; אבימלך, xx. 2; עמידוד, Num. i. 10. 'Moab,' therefore, as one can now see, has come from אמואב or עמואב, *i.e.* אֲרַם עֲרָב, 'Arabian Aram.' Also observe (*c*) that there has been a great misunderstanding of the clause introduced by הוא. 'He is the father of Moab unto to-day' is neither satisfactory nor in accordance with the text-critical facts just now referred to. הוא, as so often, means 'that is'; אבי מואב comes from ערב מ', 'Moabite Arabia.' I shall perhaps be attacked for saying that עד היום is also corrupt. But the bad sense produced ought to excite suspicion, and experience shows us how to correct the words. Both here and in xxxv. 20, where עד־היום occurs, as here, without הַזֶּה,[2] עד (as often) comes either from אֲדַד = הדד or (more simply) from עֲרַב = ער', and היום from ירחמ' (ירחמאל). Thus the gloss is twofold, and states that מואב is a designation of (1) Moabitish Arabia, and (2) Yeraḥme'elite Arabia. The two phrases mean the same thing.

Further (*d*), that in *v.* 38, where MT. has בן עמי, 𝔊 gives Αμμαν, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ γένους μου*, which Ball follows, only inserting לאמר before בן עמי. This is surely a mistake. בן עמי comes from בני עמו' (ב' עמון), written too soon by mistake. 𝔊 combines two readings. The gloss in the Hebrew text on עמון, or rather עַמָּן (𝔊), should be read, following the ‖ in *v.* 37 *b*, הוא עֲרַב בני עַמָּן עֲרַב ירחמ', 'that is, Arabia of the benê 'Ammân, Yeraḥme'elite Arabia.' עמן

[1] The form אמתעשתרת (Cooke, p. 62) is due to late modification under the influence of the tendency referred to. For parallels cp. עברמלך from ערבמלך (= ערב ירחמ'), and other names of this type. Note in this connexion אחתמלך and אחתמילכת in Phœnicia. Who would call herself 'Sister' of a god or goddess?

[2] 𝔊 does not mark the difference. Translators tend to assimilate phrases.

comes, presumably, from עם, a contraction of ערם (= אֲרָם, the southern Aram), and parallel to אב for ערב, with the termination ן־, 'belonging to.' In Assyrian, Ammânu is = Ammon, both as an ethnic and (see *KB* iv. 199) as a personal name.

Other views may be recorded. According to Hommel, Moab comes from Immo-ab, 'his mother is the father.' As for Ammon, he regards ʿAmm, 'uncle,' as a name of the moon-god, so that the benê ʿAmmon are 'sons of the moon-god'; cp. *walad ʿAmm* (children of ʿAmm), a designation of the Katabanians.[1] Juynboll, however (*Th. Ti.*, 1906, p. 166), learnedly maintains that in this connexion בֶּן־עַמִּי can only mean 'the son of my father'; similarly אֶל־עַמָּיו, 'to his fathers,' xxv. 8. Learning and sound judgment seem here to be parted. König, controverting Hommel, asks how the Ammonites came to forget the god ʿAmm (on ʿAmm see *ZDMG* xlix. 525 *f.*), after whom they were named (*Hebräisch und Semitisch*, p. 90).

SARAH IN GERAR (GEN. XX.)

HERE we have the first continuous specimen of E's narratives. It tells of Sarah's adventure in Gerar. Parallel stories are xii. 10-20, xxvi. 6-12 (see notes). The passage has several points of interest. (*a*) Geographically, the question as to the existence of two Gerars (see discussion in *E. Bib.*, 'Gerar') and whether Abimelech may be called a N. Arabian. (*b*) Religiously, the prophetic position of Abraham, and the God-fearing character of Abimelech. (*c*)

[1] *Verhandlungen des XIII. Internat. Or. Kongresses*, Sekt. v.; *Gr.* pp. 140, note 2, 163.

Morally, Abraham's mental reservation. (*d*) Legally, the way in which a double compensation is made to Abraham and to Sarah. (*e*) Commercially, the reference to standard-shekels, disclosed by textual criticism.

With regard to (*a*), a conclusion is rendered difficult by the frequency with which the same names of places or districts are current in different parts[1] (*e.g.* Miṣrim and Kush, Bethlehem, Shiḥor, Ṣarephath, etc.). Even now we find this the case in Palestine, and it is much to the point that there is, south-west of *Ain Gadîs*, a wady called *Jerûr*, in the direction of the *Wady el-Arîsh*, and that about five miles south of Gaza, there are also ruins called *Umm el-Jerûr*. Of the two claimants to be the true Gerar, the latter is the more plausible, because (1) the legendary context of the story, and (2) the fact that the parallel version of it in xii. 10-20 places the adventure of Sarah in Miṣrim, compel us to locate Gerar in the N. Arabian border-land (see *E. Bib.*, 'Gerar'). Another passage which illustrates the question is 2 Chr. xiv. 9 *f.*, 13 *f.* Zeraḥ the Kushite is there said to have encountered the Judahites under Asa in the valley of Ṣephathah by Mareshah. Evidently there was a Yerahme'elite Mareshah (cp. Josh. xiv. 13, 1 Chr. ii. 42); at least, we have no reason to suppose that there was a place called Ṣephath or Ṣephathah near the traditional Mareshah. Gerar, then, must have been to the south of Mareshah and Ṣephath (= Ṣarephath).

Three other geographical notes are given us, besides the information that 'he sojourned in Gerar.' In *v.* 1 Abraham is said to have dwelt 'between Kadesh and Shur,' and in xxi. 34, 'in the land of the Pelishtim'; and also in xx. 1, to have 'journeyed towards the land of the Negeb.' As to the first statement, it favours the view that Abraham's place of sojourn cannot have been far from the well corruptly called Beer-lahai-roi, for 'between Kadesh and Bered' (xvi. 14) cannot mean anything very different from 'between Kadesh and Shur' (see on chap. xvi.). In a connected narrative (xxi. 31) and in the context of the parallel story (xxvi. 33) we meet with the 'well of Beer-sheba,' where 'Sheba' is a

[1] It is also not impossible that גרר should rather be גדר (Gedor). Cp. MT. and 𝔊, 1 Chr. iv. 39.

corruption of 'Ishma' or 'Ishmael.' If so, 'Beer-sheba' (Well of Ishmael) and 'Beer-lahai-roi' (Well of Yeraḥme'el) are equivalent, and this is confirmed by a result independently attained elsewhere (on xxxi. 33), viz. that the name of the god of Beer-sheba was El-Yeraḥme'el. Of course, the name Beer-sheba must have existed in pre-Israelitish days, and the well which bore it (xxi. 31) cannot really have been dug by Isaac, *i.e.* virtually by Israel. That 'Beer-sheba' is the place best known to us under that name, cannot be affirmed. See, further, on chaps. xxi. xxvi.

As to the second point, it need hardly be said that the true historical Philistines did not dwell in the region referred to. Noordtzij's theory of a 'Philistine vanguard' is unlucky. It has long ago been shown[1] that פלשתים, if the text be thoroughly criticised, never means the Philistines of history, but is due to a confusion between 'Philistines' and 'Pelethites'—a thoroughly Yeraḥme'elite name.[2] Considering that in 1 S. xiv. 6 (cp. xvii. 26, 36) the Pelishtim are called 'these Arelites' (*i.e.* these Yeraḥme'elites), we can well understand that the phrase 'the land of the Pelishtim' can be used in xxi. 32 in a narrower and in *v.* 34 in a broader sense, especially (but this is by no means essential) if we hold that פלת and פלשת ultimately come from צרפת, for 'Ṣarephathites' (see on x. 14) is certainly capable of a broader and a narrower meaning. Now, too, it becomes clear that fundamentally the same traditional events can, in chap. xii., be placed in Miṣrim, and in chaps. xx. and xxvi. in Gerar. For Gerar, as we have seen, was south of Ṣarephath, which is sometimes apparently represented as the most northerly city of Muṣri (Miṣrim) in N. Arabia.

On the third point it is enough to remark that a traveller whose steps were bent to the land of Gerar would, in the first instance, have to make for 'the land of the Negeb,' and that Kadesh, which, according to Num.

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Jerahmeel,' § 3, and especially 'Zarephath.' Hommel (*Gr.* p. 158), too, has long distinguished פלתים from פלשתים.

[2] In 1 Chr. ii. 33 'Peleth' is one of the 'sons of Yeraḥme'el'; in Num. xvi. 1 he is the father of On, which (see on xli. 45) is a well-attested southern name. Cp. also, with Winckler (*GI* ii. 184), the gentilic Palṭi and the place-name Beth-peleṭ, a hypothesis which Noordtzij (p. 26) is pleased to call 'untenable.'

xxxiv. 4, was to the north of the southern boundary of the Negeb, was certainly (xx. 1) in the direction of Gerar.

Thus the Abimelech of this story (as also of xxi. 22 *ff.*, xxvi. 1 *ff.*) was a N. Arabian. Ed. Meyer's supposition, that the 'Philistines' borrowed personal names from their neighbours, is needless. The name is N. Arabian, and its bearer is so too. That it is borne by a prince of Arvad in the Annals of Ašurbanipal, and by a governor of Tyre in the Amarna letters, is not surprising, because the N. Arabians carried both personal and local names with them in their migrations. Hence its most defensible meaning is not 'Father is king' (Gray, etc.), nor 'father of a king' (Frazer, *Adonis*, p. 12), nor 'father of counsel' (Paul Haupt), but 'Arabia of Yerahme'el.'[1] It is therefore synonymous with Abram, Abraham, Malchiram (inverting), and with the Phœnician names Milk-ram and Ar-milk. It could also be borne by a woman (אב[מ]לך in Sabæan),[2] just as the Hebrew names אביגיל and אביטל (similar popular corruptions) are given to women.[3]

This result enables us to explain a very troublesome word in *v.* 11. In the text of Abraham's defence of himself we read, 'Yea, I thought, Only there is no fear of God in this place'; רק properly means 'only,' but how can that be right here? Hence one scholar renders 'certainly'; another, 'at least'; another, combining it with אין אלהים, 'nothing but fear of God there is not in this place.' But surely רק must have come from רק׳, *i.e.* רקם, which (see on Num. xxxi. 8) is a popular corruption of ירחם = ירחמאל. 'Rekem' is a gloss on 'in this place,' Gerar being a Yerahme'elite region.

Passing on to (*b*), we notice that Abraham was not a prophet (*v.* 7; cp. Ps. cv. 15, reading 'my prophet') as having been called to proclaim a higher view of God (see

[1] See on Judg. viii. 31; and cp. on 'Abraham,' Gen. xvii. 5; 'Milcah,' xi. 29.

[2] H. Derenbourg, *REJ* i. 58.

[3] Another ancient transformation (note Abd-milki in the Amarna letters) of ערבמלך (ע׳ ירחם) is עברמלך. Of course, the origin of the name must have been very early forgotten. Similarly, עברבול (Palmyrene; Cooke, p. 274) may have come from ערב בעל, and בעל, in all such names, from מעל, *i.e.* ישמעאל.

Jos. *Ant.* i. 7, 1), but as having a singular degree of intimacy with Yahweh, including the privilege of intercession (*v.* 7; cp. xviii. 22 *b*-33). That Abimelech should at once appreciate this, is not strange. Prophetism was specially connected with N. Arabia. So also was the worship of Yahweh. The suspicion expressed by Abraham (*v.* 11) is dramatically improbable. What he says must really be intended for the Elohist's contemporaries, who (it is implied) ought not to condemn all their N. Arabian neighbours indiscriminately. Just so Elijah finds an excellent worshipper of Yahweh at Ṣarephath (the 'Ṣidon' of 1 K. xvii. 8, if correctly read, is a southern Ṣidon), and the southern Aramæan Balaam, according to the earlier tradition, was a true prophet of Yahweh. Similarly, Abimelech was a scrupulously religious man, who, though not a prophet, was favoured with a vision of Elohim (*vv.* 3 *ff.*; cp. Num. xxii. 9, 'Elohim came to Balaam'). The plural התעו in *v.* 13 is not used out of regard to Abimelech as a 'heathen' (Dillm.); a plural verb with Elohim is again used by E in xxxv. 7. In both cases there is a reference to the council of the Elohim, whose leader and director was Yahweh, and who may in primitive no less than in recent times have been addressed as אדני (see *v.* 4), unless indeed אדני is substituted for ארמון = ירחמאל (see pp. 54-56, and on xv. 2).

(*c*) The mental reservation ascribed to Abraham in *v.* 12 is an attempt to relieve the patriarch from the shame of a flat falsehood (see xii. 13, xxvi. 7). Truthfulness in speech is beginning to be more valued. It is, however, a post-exilic psalmist who places truth-speaking on a level with acting righteously (Ps. xv. 2).

(*d*) The legal interest of *v.* 16 has been pointed out by Gunkel.[1] But he goes too far in assuming that the compensation for an offence to Sarah must have been paid to Abraham, because a wife could not acquire property. It is sounder doctrine that a wife's right of property was confined to what she received as a gift (cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Family,' § 5 (*c*)). In Babylonia, under Ḫammurabi, a man could present his wife with land or goods, and if he made a deed of gift, she could enjoy it for her lifetime (Code, § 150, cp. 171). On

[1] Cp., however, Winckler, *AOF* xxi. 414 *f.*

the same principle, surely, Sarah, with the permission of Abraham, could receive a present of money from Abimelech. The true text of *v.* 16 requires this ; לאחיך, 'to thy brother,' is in itself improbable, and on text-critical grounds should be corrected into ירחמאל. (See below.)

(*e*) In *v.* 16 (as also in xxiii. 15 *f.*) we find a reference to the shekel, just as in xxxiii. 19 we may probably find the mina of Salekath. Commercial standards of money were common in the ancient East, not only in Semitic but in Aryan regions (see, for the latter, Meyer, *Gesch. Alt.* iii. 99). Where Salekath was, cannot be determined ; the name סלכת, however (see on Dt. iii. 10), indicates that it was in the region called Ashkal, *i.e.* Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el. It must have been a centre for the Ishmaelite, Yeraḥme'elite, or Midianite merchants, whose standard of money was most probably accepted both in the N. Arabian border-land and in the land of Judah. A parallel phrase to 'the shekel of Salekath' is 'the shekel of Ashḥur' (Ex. xxx. 13, MT. *shekel haḳḳodesh*). I hesitate to add 2 S. xiv. 28, however tempting the passage (see *Crit. Bib.* pp. 285 *f.*), but I may point out that the 'cubit of Ishmael' is most probably mentioned in Dt. iii. 11. It is plausible to suppose that the Ishmaelite, Yeraḥme'elite, Ashḥurite, or Salekathite standard was, like the Phœnician, a derivative of the Babylonian. It is also worth stating that several different standards were in use in Assyria (see Johns, *Ass. Deeds*, iii. 542 *ff.*). One of these was possibly the Salekathite.

To justify our view we must now scrutinise the text of *v.* 16. As a recent German critic[1] has remarked, that difficult passage 'has called forth innumerable explanations.' The trouble begins with הוא לָךְ, which the R.V. (with most) renders, 'it is for thee,' but with an alternative version, 'he is for thee' (so Ibn Ezra and Ewald). The latter rendering is peremptorily rejected by Driver, but is really the most obvious one, for לאחיך comes just before. We then get the unusual phrase כסות עינים ; how shall we explain it? *BDB* say, 'covering of the eyes, so that they cannot see the wrong ; fig. of a present offered in compensation for it.' The phrase, however, so understood, is too poetical or

[1] J. Wellecz, *OLZ*, Sept. 1904, col. 336.

rhetorical to be expected here. 'Veil' (Onk., Ewald, Winckler) would be much more plausible, if there were any parallel for such a use. Still more improbable is what follows—לכל אשר אתך ואת כל, 'for all who are with thee, and with all'? Grammatical subtlety fails us in such cases altogether. The remedy, however, is not far to seek. We have to recognise the twofold fact that certain groups of letters recur in it in the most unlikely manner, and that these groups resemble certain frequently recurring corruptions of ירחמאל, ישמעאל, and סלכת. The first part of this has been noticed by Wellecz,[1] who gives a table of the recurring groups of letters, but cannot control or connect his results by the experience won from the application of the N. Arabian key. And yet it is with this experience that we must begin. It is usual, whenever emphasis has to be laid on the full weight or value, to add to the specification of the amount a reference to the commercial standard (see above). It is therefore *a priori* likely that such a reference should occur early in *v.* 16, and that הנה הוא, which has the appearance of being a gloss, should supplement and explain this reference. Now there is one word in *v.* 16 (just before the gloss) which is in itself so improbable[2] that we must suspect it. It is לאחיך, which, like על-אחיך in xlviii. 22, has no doubt come from ירחמאל (ר and ך confounded); the phrase 'silver of Yerahme'el' occurs again in xxiii. 9 (cp. *v.* 15). Thus the speech of Abimelech becomes, 'Behold, I give a thousand [shekels] of silver of Yerahme'el'; the close of the speech, however, is *cut off by the gloss.*

Passing on now to the gloss (*v.* 16), we must take לך and נסות (נסת) together. When combined, they represent the place-name Salekath (see above, *d*); סכות in xxxiii. 17 and קשיטה in xxxiii. 19 have, beyond doubt, the same origin. עינים, as in xxxviii. 14, 21, most probably comes from ימען, *i.e.* ישמעאל (ל, as often, passes into ן). לכל must

[1] See article referred to.

[2] We should have expected לאישך, 'to thy husband.' It is a poor answer that Abimelech wished to emphasise the fact that Abraham had called himself Sarah's brother. Indeed, it is not at all clear that the money would have been handed over to Abraham. See above (*d*).

be explained in accordance with the preceding כל; it is a fragment of סלכת. אֲשֶׁר, as often, should be אַשֻּׁר, and both אתך and את כל have come from אתבעל, *i.e.* ישמעאל. Thus the gloss (which is twofold) becomes, 'surely, that (viz. Yerahme'el) is Salekath of Ishmael, Salekath of Asshur-Ishmael'; *i.e.* this is the commercial centre from which the money-standard is derived. And last of all comes Abimelech's closing word, וְנֹכַחְתִּ, 'and so thou art justified (righted).' The whole verse now runs thus, ולשרה אמר הנה נתתי אלף כסף ירחמ' הנה הוא סלכת ישמעאל סלכת אַשֻּׁר ישמ' וְנֹכַחְתִּ.

BIRTH OF ISAAC; HAGAR DISMISSED
(GEN. XXI. 1-21)

THE promise is fulfilled, and a son—the rather unimportant Isaac[1]—is born by Sarah to Abraham. But maternal jealousy is aroused; law is appealed to, and Ishmael and Hagar are expelled. Doubtless a fascinating narrative—so graphically told, and psychologically so true. The mother watches Ishmael at his play (*vv.* 8 *f.*), and finds it intolerable that Ishmael should be joint-heir with Isaac. Abraham, being Ishmael's as well as Isaac's father, is pained at the demand which Sarah makes, but is reconciled to it on receiving a divine oracle (*vv.* 12 *f.*). Hagar and the child Ishmael are sent away into the wilderness (see on *vv.* 14, 16 *f.*, 20). The water is soon spent. Hagar lays her child in the scanty shade of a desert-shrub,

[1] Isaac is really a mere duplicate of Abraham. Note that the Beer-sheba of which Isaac is the hero (xxvi. 32 *f.*) is also the dwelling-place of Abraham (xxi. 33).

and sits down near him to watch. The child weeps, and the divine director of human affairs is touched at the sound. From heaven he calls to Hagar, and bids her take up and hold her child, for he (as well as Isaac) is destined to become a great people. So Elohim opened her eyes, and she saw a well; then she filled her water-skin, and quenched the thirst of her child.

The narrative is as simple as it is beautiful when glosses have been removed. But we must not be ungrateful for the glosses; they confirm the view already expressed (see on xv. 1), that Hagar was not an Egyptian but a N. Arabian. In fact, the author of the glosses has done all that he could to emphasise the fact that the scene of the legend is in N. Arabia. In spite of this, we cannot say that it contains anything subversive of a belief in its Israelitish origin.

As to the contents, much more cannot be said here. The legal aspects of the treatment of Hagar are well treated by S. A. Cook, *The Laws of Moses and the Code of Hammurabi*, pp. 116-118. The religious aspects are, for us, more important. That a divine Being should have cared for a bond-woman is a beautiful feature of the Hebrew legend. And who was this divine Being? He is called both Elohim and Mal'ak-Elohim. 'Elohim' is probably a substitute for 'Yahweh,' which is the name of the leader and director of the divine duad or triad. It is no objection to this view that 'Elohim' has probably originated in 'Yeraḥme'el,' for the origin of the word was of course forgotten when it came to be thus used. What a great position Mal'ak-Yahweh held, we have seen already (on xvi. 7).

But we cannot understand the contents aright without further textual inquiry. On *v.* 16 *a* Gunkel remarks thus: 'The mother's eye cannot bear to look upon the death-agony of the child. So she goes a little way off—but oh, thou dear, inconsistent maternal heart!—not too far,' and, like most other scholars, Gunkel translates הַרְחֵק כְּמִטַּחֲוִי קֶשֶׁת 'as far as about a bow-shot.' The literal rendering, however, is 'distant like shooters with the bow.' This does not make sense. Hence 𝔊 gives *μακρότερον ὡσεὶ τόξου βολήν*, changing 'shooters' into 'shot,' and König paraphrases, 'according to the usual distance of the mark from archers' (*Synt.*

§ 264 *b*). But let us look more closely at the text. A Pilel form of a verb (טחה) found nowhere else can hardly pass unquestioned, and experience shows that קשת is not seldom corrupt (see *v.* 20, Hos. vii. 16, Isa. lxvi. 17, Jer. iv. 29, Ps. lx. 6, lxxviii. 9, 57). What קשת represents is plain; קש (שק) is often a fragment of אַשְׁחֻר, and קשת in the suspected passages probably represents אשחרת (the feminine of אשחר). Turning to כמטחורי, we must, first of all, divide it into two parts. כמט, like מכות, 2 Chr. ii. 9 (see on 1 K. v. 25), may well represent מעכת, while חורי may represent either הוא ('that is'), thus producing the sense, 'that is, Ashḥoreth,' or else חור, a fragment of אשחור, an alternative reading to אשחרת. The sense of the whole passage becomes, either 'at some distance from Maacath, that is, Ashḥoreth,' or '. . . from Maacath-Ashḥur [Ashḥoreth].' It is a gloss defining the situation of the well. Cp. xvi. 7, where the fountain is said to have been 'on the way to Shur (Asshur).' The coincidence is complete. The second ות׳ מנגד is, of course, redactional (Ball). The result of the insertion was that the 'weeping' of the next clause was transferred from the child to his mother. But the mother's grief was surely too deep for tears.

The speech of the kindly Mal'ak-Yahweh is now plain —all except the closing words, באשר הוא שם. Again Gunkel disappoints us; for how can the words mean 'ebenda wo er liegt,' and how could 'ebenda wo er liegt' involve a play on the name באר שבע (see Gunkel's note)? Experience clears up the difficulty. אַשֶּׁר and שם often stand respectively for אַשֻּׁר and שמע (= ישמעאל); הוא frequently introduces a gloss. Thus we get the sense, 'in Asshur, that is, Ishmael,' a gloss most probably on the situation of the well (*v.* 19).

Lastly, as to the brief description of Ishmael's subsequent fortunes. As Knobel and Dillmann have remarked, ויגדל and רֹבֶה together are too much, at least if רֹבֶה means 'becoming great' (Job xxxix. 4). Hence it is proposed to read either רֹבֵה קֶשֶׁת or רֹמֵה ק׳. But observe (1) that רָבָה, 'to shoot (arrows)' is a *ἅπ. λεγ.*, and that רבב, a supposed cognate, cannot be proved to exist by xlix. 25 (see note), and (2) that רמה ק׳ (רומי) in Jer. iv. 29, Ps. lxxviii. 9, is probably corrupt (cp. on *v.* 16). ויהי, as often elsewhere,

comes from והוא. Thus, for ויהי ר׳ ק׳ we should restore והוא עֲרַב אַשְׁחֹרֶת, 'that is, Arabia of Ashḥoreth,' probably a gloss on במדבר. *V.* 21 *a* is, of course, an alternative reading. Need I add that Ishmael's wife was brought, not from Miṣraim, but from Miṣrim? What evidence or probability is there that the Ishmaelites or Yeraḥme'elites were mixed with Egyptian elements?

ABIMELECH'S COVENANT WITH ABRAHAM
(GEN XXI. 22-34)

ONCE more Abraham is glorified; with what respect he is treated by the lord of Beersheba! At the same time, the later occupation of the place by the Israelites is justified, the name 'Beersheba' (cp. on chap. xx.) is explained, and the fundamental identity of the worship of Yahweh with that of Yeraḥme'el is affirmed (*v.* 33).

Abimelech we have met with before; he dwells in the 'land of the Pelishtîm' (*v.* 32; see introduction to chap. xx.). Beside him stands the unexplained figure of Pikol (also xxvi. 26). Was he once upon a time great in the legend (see Gunkel)? And what means the name? 'Mouth (*i.e.* spokesman) of all' (Ges. *HWB*[8]) is absurd. Stucken (*AM*, p. 13, note) suggests as the origin Pap-sukal (Assyrian name for a divine messenger). Spiegelberg (*OLZ*, Feb. 1906) invokes Egyptian help, and explains as pa-Ḥori, 'the man of Ḥaru' (Syria and Palestine); cp. Pi-neḥas, 'the negro.' The comparison, however, is not helpful (see on Ex. vi. 25). פיכל, like אבימלך, comes from ערב ירחמאל;[1] the link is בימלך (cp. ערב ירחמ׳ = במהל, 1 Chr. vii. 33). It is, therefore, really

[1] Cp. also פיבסת (Ezek. xxx. 17) from אבישמעת, and פי־החירת (Ex. xiv. 2) from אבי־אשחורת.

a variant to אבימלך. שר צבאו must be explained as in Judg. iv. 2, where 'Yabīn, king of Canaan,' is parallel to שר־צבאו סיסרא, or rather שר־צבעון, *i.e.* שר ישמ', 'prince of Ishmael.' Probably there were two early recensions of the story, in one of which the chieftain with whom Abraham had dealings was called 'Abimelech, king of the Philistines' (as in xxvi. 8), and in the other, 'Bimelech, a prince of Ishmael' (*i.e.* one of the princes of the Ishmaelite region).

We now come to the etymology of Beer-sheba. באר שבע, according to J, means 'well of seven,' *i.e.* 'of seven lambs,' thus pointing to a great sacrifice in the olden time. Most moderns, however (see *e.g.* W. R. Smith, *RS*(2), p. 181; Nöldeke, *Arch. Rel.-wiss.* vii. 340 *ff.*), explain it as 'seven wells.' Certainly 'seven' is a sacred number, either from the planets (including sun and moon), or more probably from the Pleiades. But what right have we to assume the post-position of the numeral (Ewald, Dillmann, Stade)?[1] We must therefore venture to differ from the majority, even after the collection of fresh parallels for 'seven wells' in the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, viii. 155 *f.* Boscawen suggests 'well of the seven allied tribes'; Winckler, consistently enough, 'well of the Seven-god,' *i.e.* of the moon-god, one of whose numerical symbols was seven (*GI* ii. 83, cp. 48). The key, however, is supplied by Ḳiryath-arba', where *arba'* has come from *'arâb* (see on xxiii. 2). שבע is a corruption of שמע = [אל]ישמע (see on 'Sheba,' x. 7), so that 'Beer-sheba' is properly 'well of Sheba' or 'of Ishmael.'[2] The writer of *v.* 31, however, interprets 'well of an oath' (cp. xxvi. 33).

At this venerated spot (Am. viii. 14, see p. 46) Abraham the Yeraḥme'elite planted a sacred tree (*v.* 33), and called with the name Yahweh, 'citing' him, as it were, to occupy the spot.[3] But Yahweh was not the only divine name used by the patriarch. He appended the title אל עולם, which is neither 'the everlasting God' (Isa. xl. 28), nor 'the ancient

[1] The travellers' dispute as to the number of wells at Bir 'es-Seba (28 m. S.W from Hebron) does not concern us here.

[2] The numerals play sad tricks with ancient texts and traditions. Think of the Phœnician divine name 'Eshmun' being explained as 'eighth' (see p. 42).

[3] Gunkel, *Genesis*(2), p. 48.

God,' nor 'the God of the world' (the Bab. 'mummu'),[1] none of which are natural here, but a combination of אל with some popular abbreviation of ירחמאל,[2] such as יעלם (see on xxxvi. 14). That Yahweh and Yeraḥme'el together formed a divine duad we have seen already; also that Yahweh was the supreme director. The latter point also comes out in the title 'El-Yeraḥme'el.'[3] Compare what has been said on xiv. 18 *ff.* (pp. 37, 253 *f.*), where *inter alia* some important glosses on the divine name are indicated; also on xvii. 1.

Lastly, as to the sacred tree, which here, to our surprise, is called אֵשֶׁל (1 S. xxii. 6, xxxi. 13; 1 Chr. x. 12 substitutes אֵלָה). Most compare the Ar. *'athl*, which corresponds phonetically, and means 'tamarisk.' But was the tamarisk specially sacred except in Egypt?[4] It would seem that 𝔊, which has *ἐφύτευσεν ἄρουραν*, read ערור, *i.e.* ערער or ערוער (Jer. xvii. 6, xlviii. 6). This may come either from אֶשֶׁרָה (*E. Bib.*, 'Tamarisk'; *Crit. Bib.* pp. 238, 247),[5] or from אַשֻּׁר (=תאשור), an 'Asshur-tree' (cp. Hos. ix. 13, p. 266). This gives us a hint for אשל, which (cp. שאול and אלוש) may reasonably be traced to ישמעאל. It is true, the 'Ishmael-tree' was more often called עץ שמן (1 K. vi. 23, 31 *f.*, Neh. viii. 15, Isa. xli. 19), but this does not exclude another popular corruption of the same name. There are also traces (see on Dt. xii. 2) of a tree or trees of Yeraḥme'el. Such was probably the *rimmon*-tree, *i.e.* the pomegranate, and perhaps the *'armōn*-tree, *i.e.* the plane. Possibly one of these trees is meant.

[1] Winckler, *AOF* xxi. 305 *f.*, 416.

[2] Cp. vi. 4, Ps. xxiv. 7, 9 (*Ps.*[(2)]), where in like manner עולם represents ירחם; also 1 Chr. vii. 16, where Ulam and Reḳem are brothers.

[3] A title, מרא עלמא, occurs in a Palmyrene inscription of A.D. 114 (de Vogüé). It is appended to בעל שמן, *i.e.* Baal Ishman (Ishmael). The original meaning of the titles was, of course, forgotten. The Χρόνος and Οὐλωμός of Phœnician mythology may also, perhaps, be similarly explained.

[4] Maspero, *Dawn of Civ.* p. 28, note 3.

[5] Ed. Meyer, with his usual neglect of *E. Bib.*, etc., refers to a scanty communication of Stade's in a letter to von Gall (*Die Israeliten*, p. 257; cp. v. Gall, *Kultstätten*, p. 47).

OFFERING OF ISAAC (GEN. XXII. 1-19)

As all will agree, a most interesting but not easily intelligible narrative (see *E. Bib.*, 'Isaac,' 'Jehovah-jireh'). How is it, we may ask, that Elohim issues a command, and then takes it back? We can understand how the vicarious sacrifice of a ram for a child might be ascribed to an oracle of Elohim, but not how the same Elohim can (according to a widely spread interpretation of *v.* 2) have been represented as the author of the practice of child-sacrifice. We should have comprehended if Abraham, like Jephthah, had made a vow which, as things turned out, required him to offer up his own child, and if Elohim had, according to the legend, interposed, ordaining the sacrifice of a ram; but we are surprised when Elohim is stated to have first directed and afterwards forbidden the sacrifice of Abraham's 'only son.' When, however, we look more closely at the story of the offering up of Isaac, we see that the first and principal part of it is bathed in the tender glow of a nascent spiritual faith.[1] Nothing is said (as by Philo of Byblus) of the peril of the country requiring such a sacrifice. It is an episode in Abraham's life of faith which is brought before us. 'Elohim,' we are told, 'tried Abraham.' That is, God determined to assure himself how far the loyalty of his servant would reach. Would he remonstrate when so hard a thing was asked as the sacrifice of his 'only son'?

The narrative appeals to us almost as much perhaps as it can have done to its first readers and hearers. But is it not clear that there must have been an earlier form—indeed, earlier forms—of the story? Among these we may include

[1] Cp. Bishop Warburton, *Divine Legation of Moses*, Bk. vi. sect. 5 (*Works*, vi. 37).

the brief tale in Philo of Byblus;[1] but I must add that, though it may have come ultimately from N. Arabia, it is too recent in its present form to be worth discussing here. There is, I think, another form of the story, which, though not preserved in any literary record, may, with some confidence, be assumed, and which is of N. Arabian origin, viz. that once upon a time a Yeraḥme'elite hero, known as Abraham (his earlier name—see on xvii. 5—not having been preserved), actually offered up his only son, in obedience to an oracle of the god of the land. And the course of the evolution of religion elsewhere renders it certain that the growth of the spirit of humanity at length led the Israelitish as well as the Syrian priesthoods to ordain the vicarious sacrifice of one of the lower animals. We may also probably assume that this alteration of a sacred custom was justified by the authority of another oracle, the reflexion of which we have in xxii. 11-13.

A word or two more as to the substitution of an animal. The idea was that the lower animals were closely akin to man, and that therefore the offering of one of them was a possible surrogate for human sacrifice. At the Syrian Laodicea (= Phœn. Ramitha) it was a stag which was chosen.[2] With the Israelites or Yeraḥme'elites it was a ram. An ox would, of course, not have done; this animal was sacrosanct, as being a symbol of Yahweh-Yeraḥme'el.

If we ask who the god of the land referred to above probably was, the answer must be—Yeraḥme'el, the name which at any rate the Israelites recognised as belonging to this god, and which was often corrupted into Melek and Mal'ak.[3] And we can now give an answer to the question

[1] For the Phœnician story see Müller, *Fragm. Hist. Græc.* iii. 570 *f.* It runs thus:—Κρόνος . . . υἱὸν ἔχων μονογενῆ, ὃν διὰ τοῦτο Ἰεδουδ ἐκάλουν, τοῦ μονογενοῦς οὕτως ἔτι καὶ νῦν καλουμένου παρὰ τοῖς Φοίνιξι, κινδύνων ἐκ πολέμου μεγίστων κατειληφότων τὴν χώραν βασιλικῷ κοσμήσας σχήματι τὸν υἱὸν, βωμὸν δὲ κατασκευασάμενος κατέθυσεν. Cp. Baudissin, *Studien zur semit. Religionsgeschichte*, ii. 154 *ff.*

[2] The yearly stag-sacrifice at Laodicea continued as late as the second century A.D. Cp. W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.*(2) pp. 409, 466; *E. Bib.*, col. 2178.

[3] This is the Milk which appears, in composition, both in Phœnician personal names and in the names of deities. For Mal'ak see on xvi. 7.

asked (after Eerdmans, but more hesitatingly) by Kautzsch, 'whether the *melek* to whom these sacrifices [in Topheth] were offered is not meant to stand for a special form of Yahweh.'[1] Yahweh and Yeraḥme'el were, in fact, united as the name of the god of the Israelites, though the deity to whom the child-sacrifices were originally offered was the N. Arabian god Yeraḥme'el, perhaps also to his fellow-deity Ashtart.[2] See, further, pp. 50-52 (on Melek).

If we further inquire how Isaac can be described as Abraham's 'only son,'[3] with total disregard of Ishmael, a satisfactory answer can now be given. It appears that Isaac has drawn to himself some features of the mythic Tammuz or Adonis. More precisely, he corresponds, at least in part, to the Dusares who, both at Petra and at Elusa, was worshipped as 'the only begotten of the Lord'[4] (*μονογενὴς τοῦ Δεσπότου*). Possibly, in another form of the myth, Isaac like Adonis died and rose again (cp. pp. 56 *f.*).

Our result is that the Hebrew writer whom we call the Elohist took that older story of Abraham and his sacrifice of his 'only son' and recast it. Well did he perform his task. The dry and repulsive ancient myth became the beautiful story that we know so well, telling of the journey of the loving father, whose lips are sealed by inward knowledge, and the innocently questioning lad, to the sad and solemn place of sacrifice, the place where Isaac, questioning no more, suffers himself to be bound upon the wood (*i.e.* on the altar), when suddenly the voice of Mal'ak-Elohim is heard, proclaiming the divine satisfaction at the moral result of the trial, and the retractation of the command. With this the Elohist connects the traditional story of the sub-

A title of this god was probably 'El-Yeraḥme'el,' 'divinity of Yeraḥme'el'; see on xxi. 33. When Philo of Byblus identifies the Phœnician El with Kronos, he, or rather his authority, means by El 'El-Yeraḥme'el,' a title which the Arabians may have taken, with much besides, to Phœnicia.

[1] Kautzsch in Hastings' *DB*, extra volume, p. 690 *a*.

[2] Cp. Isaac of Antioch, ed. Bickell, i. 221, 'boys and girls they sacrificed to the star of Venus.'

[3] 𝔊 here gives *ἀγαπητός*, but in Judg. xi. 34 *μονογενής* (B), to which A adds *αὐτῷ ἀγαπητή*.

[4] Epiphanius, *Hær.* 51; cp. Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, p. 74.

stitution of a ram for the child—a poor conclusion, but doubtless necessary for the information of the early readers.

Such is perhaps the best theory of the origin and meaning of the narrative before us. The basis of the story is ultimately mythological (see p. 325). Compare, or contrast, the story of Jephthah and his daughter. That story, too, as we find it in Judg. xi. 34-40, is pale enough as compared with what may have been the ancient myth, or with the earliest legendary transformation of it. But it lacks the psychological charm of the story of Abraham and Isaac. It may be remarked here that the note in *vv.* 39 *b*-40 relative to the annual mourning of Israelite women, to those who can see below later phraseology, points to a primitive ritual mourning for a divine being, such as most critics (but very possibly—see *Crit. Bib.*—by an error) have found in Ezek. viii. 14 and Zech. xii. 11, and such as may conceivably have existed in the sacred place to which Abraham is said to have journeyed (cp. pp. 47 *f.*).

There is yet another narrative besides that of Jephthah which may plausibly be mentioned in this connexion. It is difficult not to think that the tradition on which Ex. xii. 29-36 was based was virtually a protest against child-sacrifices. The slaying of the Miṣrite (not Egyptian) first-born may have been represented as the punishment inflicted upon the oppressors of Israel, by the offended Yahweh, to strengthen the Israelites (now religiously in advance of the Miṣrites) in their resolve no longer to sacrifice human first-born. See the exposition of this view in *E. Bib.*, 'Plagues,' § 5.

It would, however, be a mistake to regard the author of our narrative as having had the object of directly protesting against such offerings. That he was opposed to them, may safely be assumed, but in his time this kind of sacrifice was apparently not common among the Israelites. It is plain enough that afterwards it began again to fascinate them;[1] the stress of the times, and the increased religious as well as political influence which criticism appears to assign to

[1] Cp. Moore, *E. Bib.*, 'Molech'; Eerdmans, *Melekdienst* (1891); Tiele, *Geschiedenis van den godsdienst in de oudheid*, i. (1893), pp. 227-229.

N. Arabia, will account for this. The name Melek (Molek) was, in fact, equivalent to Yerahme'el—that N. Arabian divinity who was (as has become highly probable) combined in the worship of the Israelites with Yahweh.

The spirit of the beautiful narrative has had the fullest justice done to it by Gunkel. Uppermost in the narrator's mind was the religious character of the model Israelite. Nothing was too precious for this hero of faith or devotion to give to Elohim, but there was something too precious for Elohim, as Abraham's friend as well as master, to accept.

I have assumed that the story is N. Arabian, just as I have assumed that the illustrative story in Ex. xii. 29 *ff.* is N. Arabian. The former assumption is justified partly by the N. Arabian scenery of the earlier Abraham-legends; partly by necessary corrections of corrupt passages in the narrative before us. One of these passages is *v.* 2, where we meet with the difficult phrase 'the land of Moriah.' Few will any longer maintain that 'Moriah' was so usual as the name of the temple-hill at Jerusalem that the whole neighbourhood could be named after it; and the fact that even the editor of JE, who gave xxii. 1-19 its present form, does not make Abraham call the sacred spot 'Moriah,' but (if the text is right) 'Yahweh-yir'eh,' gives a strong argument against the traditional view. The only other passage where המוריה occurs (2 Chr. iii. 1) may very possibly be no longer in its original form, *i.e.* the older text on which the Chronicler works may have run differently (see *Crit. Bib.* p. 312). המ׳ therefore cannot be right. Sam., 𝔊, and Pesh. all give us hints of a truer reading, if we are wise enough to use them. The first gives המוראה, which reminds us that, in 2 S. xxiii. 21, מראה (like אריה and אראל) has come from some form nearer to ירחמאל; the second, *τὴν ὑψηλήν*, which it also gives in xii. 6 for מורה (see on xii. 6); the third, 'land of the Amorites.' These renderings all suggest אמר or ארמ as an element in the true reading, and the sense will certainly be given if we read ירחמאל.[1]

The 'land of Yerahme'el,' then, was the name of the

[1] My earlier suggestion, approved by Winckler (*GI* ii. 44, note 1), was מצרים (צ might have fallen out after ארץ).

region whither Abraham was sent. But surely the patriarch needed still more definite instructions. We have seen that in xii. 1 the idea that Abraham did not know the goal of his journey is a mistake. A similar conclusion is forced upon us here.[1] Following parallels too numerous to mention, אחד ההרים should be corrected into אַשְׁחֶר ירחם, while the cases of xii. 1 and (more especially) of xxvi. 2 and xxxi. 49 justify the restoration of אֲשֶׁר אֵרֶם ירחמ׳ for אשר אמר עליך (cp. on *vv.* 3, 9, 14). To avoid mistake, it may be added that each of the three latter words is found elsewhere miswritten for the corresponding word in the suggested combined restoration, and that ירחמאל is, of course, a mere gloss on אֵרֶם. It is probable that Ashḥur- or Ashtar-Yeraḥme'el was the name both of a mountain and of a city upon it (see on Dt. iii. 27). It may also perhaps have been called Gibeath-Yeraḥme'el (*Crit. Bib.* on Jer. ii. 34, iii. 23). To this spot[2] it was that those who steeled themselves against the cries of children appear to have resorted for the most terrible of sacrifices. We can hardly doubt that the words 'on Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el' are a gloss; the effect is heightened if *v.* 2 is made to close at לְעֹלָה.

In *v.* 3 a veil is once more thrown over the name of the sanctuary; the concealment, however, involves the editor in an inconsistency, for Yahweh had *not* told Abraham which was the mountain to go to. Instead, therefore, of אשר אמר לו האלהים read אֲשֶׁר ירחמאל (see on *v.* 2). לו is not unfrequently miswritten for אל, and אלהים[ה] may sometimes, with good reason, be taken as a disguise of חמאל[ר]. 'Yeraḥme'el,' it appears, was dittographed. So too in *v.* 9.

And now (*v.* 8) Abraham himself reveals to the careful reader the name of the sacred place. There were various

[1] Gunkel may be referred to here. He thinks that there is a *lacuna* after *v.* 2. The mountain must have been referred to (see *v.* 3 end), but later scribes omitted the reference, because it was inconsistent with their own theory. This is one of those expedients in which literary criticism delights, but which are slight and ineffectual remedies for the imperfections of the texts.

[2] It is not meant that this was the only spot. In Palestine proper (*e.g.* at Gezer) there were no doubt sanctuaries at which this grim rite was practised.

abbreviations of 'Yeraḥme'el.' One of them was 'Aram' (see *vv.* 2, 3, 9); another was יאל (*v.* 13); another was 'Yeruel' (2 Chr. xx. 16) or 'Yeriel' (1 Chr. vii. 2). אלהים יראה־לו is evidently suggested by the form ירואל; indeed, most probably, לו is a corruption of אֵל (see preceding note), so that אלהים will be a late insertion, subsequent to the corruption referred to.[1] Cp. on *v.* 14.

The mediator between Yahweh and mankind is Yeraḥme'el. But the old N. Arabian deity has been combined, in Israelitish belief, with Yahweh. So Mal'ak-Yahweh, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh (see on xvi. 7), interposes (*vv.* 11 *f.*), to communicate the heavenly decree. Gunkel has the right impression, but makes a wrong inference from it. 'The angel speaks,' he says, 'as if God; this points to an earlier recension in which, not an angel, but God himself spoke.'

There is no cause to doubt אֵיל (*v.* 13), but very much to suspect אַחַר. Neither 'behind' nor 'afterwards' is a satisfactory sense. Sam., 𝔊, Pesh., Jubilees, Onk., Jon., and MSS., besides some moderns (including König, *Synt.* p. 279, top), prefer אֶחָד. One would like some more expressive word, however, and it happens that both אחד and אחר often represent אַשְׁחֹר. This must be the case here with אחר, and if so, we should probably supply ירחמאל; *i.e.* read the compound phrase Yeraḥme'el-Ashḥur, understanding it as a marginal correction of the corruption אשר יאמר היום (*v.* 14). ירחמאל was probably written יאל (for shortness), and this fell out owing to its likeness to איל.

We now come to the riddle—'Yahweh yir'eh' (*v.* 14). In view of *v.* 8 we should most naturally render 'Yahweh selects,' but this does not suit יִרְאֶה. Should the two parts of *v.* 14 be harmonised (cp. Driver)? The truth surely is that יהוה יראה at the end of *v.* 8 is repeated in error. אשר יאמר היום has come from אַשֶׁר ארם ירחמאל, where 'ירחמ, is, of course, a gloss on אֲרָם (cp. on *v.* 2). בהר, which now follows 'אשר וגו, should certainly precede these words. We

[1] Gunkel thinks it likely that the name of the place of sacrifice was 'Yeruel,' and that it was near Tekoa (2 Chr. xx. 16). The origin of 'Yeruel' has not occurred to him. Oort's criticisms (*Theol. Tijdschr.* 1901, pp. 552 *f.*) and Ed. Meyer's (*Die Israeliten*, p. 256) are not cogent enough.

can now, perhaps, solve the opening riddle. The original reading may have been יראה אל. The יהוה prefixed in the traditional text was probably put in after the אל in יראה אל had fallen out (cp. on *v.* 8). Thus the name 'Yeruel' (*v.* 8) is ascribed to Abraham, for יראה אל is a transparent disguise.

More disguises await us in *v.* 17, in the supplementary speech of Mal'ak-Yahweh. It is usually supposed that where a large number of people is compared to the sand it is an Oriental hyperbole. But why should there be two hyperboles—'as the stars . . . as the sand?' Looking closer, we find that, either deliberately or because he had to work upon ill-written texts, the redactor has put 'and as the sand[1] which is on the sea-shore' instead of 'Yeraḥme'el-Asshur (ירחמ' אשר) as far as (עַד) the shore of the lake.' Similar corrections have to be made in xxxii. 13, Josh. xi. 4, Judg. vii. 12, 1 S. xiii. 5, 2 S. xvii. 11, 1 K. v. 9. The restored words, in our passage, are a gloss on אֲשֶׁר עֲרָבִים, words which underlie the traditional reading, שער איביו (see on xxiv. 60). 'The lake' (הַיָּם) means the Dead Sea (see on ים המלח, xiv. 3). Surely the effect of the promise is heightened—'I will multiply thine offspring as the stars of heaven'; what more needs to be said (cp. xv. 5)? And if it be asked, what there is to attract in the closing promise, 'and thine offspring shall seize upon Asshur of the Arabians' (gloss, 'Yeraḥme'el-Asshur as far as' etc.), the answer is, Because this region was hallowed by the consecrated traditional legends.

[1] For the corrupt כחול compare כלה, Gen. x. 11, חכילה, 1 S. xxiii. 19, and חכלילי, Gen. xlix. 12.

THE SONS OF NAḤOR (GEN. xxii. 20-24)

A GROUP of tribes. The benê Naḥor are here apparently planned after the model of the twelve sons of Israel, of Ishmael, and of Esau. Partly they come from a wife, partly from a concubine; their origin, then, is not equally noble. There were, of course, not really twelve tribes; the combination is artificial. It is, however, highly probable that 'Naḥor' was the name of a considerable tract of country, the full name of which was Arab-naḥor (see on xxiv. 10, xxxi. 53). The names are difficult, but remunerate a methodical investigation. Let us remember that Milkah as well as Naḥor is a N. Arabian name (see on xi. 29).

In *v.* 21 three glosses have intruded into the text. They do not, however, relate to the names which they follow, but most probably to the whole list of names. The annotator meant (cp. xxv. 18) to say that the region of these tribes might be called either Yeraḥme'el-Ashḥur or Arab-Arâm. ירחמאל-אשחור underlies בכרו אחיו; ערב-ארם is disguised as אבי ארם. Similar corruptions abound; see especially on iv. 20 *f.*, x. 5, xvi. 12, xi. 29. What reason can there be for calling Uṣ 'his firstborn,' or for uniting Uṣ more closely to Būz than to his other brethren (as if they were twins)? The meaning of Uṣ is obscure (see on x. 23); בוז, however, originated in בעז, or some similar form, corrupted in the popular speech from ישמעאל. Cp. זאב, זבול, [ה]עזוב, all from this widely spread name (cp. on 1 K. vii. 21). In Jer. xxv. 23 'Būz' occurs after Dedan and Tema, both N. Arabian districts; in Job xxxii. 2, Elihu, of the family of Ram [= Yeraḥme'el], is a Būzite; on Ezek. i. 3 see *Crit. Bib. ad loc.* There was probably more than one Būz. Esar-

haddon tells us of a land of Bāzū—a desolate region (*KB* ii. 131), near N. Arabia, but surely not meant here.

Another interesting name (still in *v.* 21) is קמואל. In 1 Chr. v. 14 'Michael' and 'Būz' are brought together, precisely as 'Būz' and 'Kemūel' here. That מיכאל has come from ירחמאל, we have seen (on xvi. 7); nor can we reasonably doubt that קמואל has the same origin. The occurrences in Num. xxxiv. 24 and 1 Chr. xxvii. 17 are not opposed to this, Shiphtan and Hashabiah being demonstrably N. Arabian names. Moreover, in 1 Chr. iv. 26 חמואל occurs with 'Mishma' and 'Shimei,' both Ishmaelite names; חמואל and קמואל are as closely related as רקם and ירחם; cp. also the names קדמיאל, יקמיה, יקמעם, and קמון, and the scribal corruption מעקל (Hab. i. 4), all which have the same origin. The appended words אבי ארם are surprising; Dillm. thinks ארם must here have a narrower sense than in x. 22 *f.* See, however, above; 'Aramæan (Yerahme'elite) Arabia' is a general title for the list. Gunkel's inference (p. 215) from what he confesses to be a gloss (he adheres to 'father of Aram'), that the Nahorites were the ancestors of 'the later historical Aramæans,' and that after the disappearance of the Nahorite people single tribes persisted as 'Aramæans,' seems imprudent, because based on an excessive trust in the present redaction of the texts of the O.T.

In *v.* 22 the capacity of the ordinary criticism is not less severely strained. 'We hardly expect,' says Driver, 'to find a tribe [Kesed] belonging to the extreme S. of Babylonia grouped with Aramaic tribes centred at Ḥaran.' Gunkel goes a step further, and says, 'These Kasdim, who are not to be confounded with the Bab. Kasdim, though originally akin to them, are an Aramæan tribe of Beduins, also mentioned in 2 K. xxiv. 2 and Job i. 17.' This is also Winckler's theory. There is, however, better evidence for the view that כשדים (as also דמשק) is miswritten for כַּשְׂרָם, which, for shortness, was sometimes written כשר׳, and that the origin of Kashram is Ashḥur-Aram. See on xi. 28, also on 'Meshek,' x. 2, and on Isa. x. 9, where the cities mentioned are probably N. Arabian, and where, for 'Karkemish' (Ass. Gargamish), we should rather read 'Kashram.'

As to חזו (Ḥazo), the rocky, mountainous land of Ḫazû,

mentioned with the arid land of Bâzu by Esar-haddon (see above, on Būz), can hardly be meant. It is surely a clan-name, and may have attached itself to more than one district. We may group it with חזאל, חזיאל, חזיה, יחזיאל, יחזיה, and probably also with אחזי, אחזיה, אחזת; probably, therefore, חזו has come from שחו, *i.e.* אשחור.—The strange name פלדש is obviously a compound. Possibly it comes from בלשר (1 Esdr. v. 8) or בלשן (Ezr. ii. 2, Neh. vii. 7), which, however explained, point to N. Arabia (see on Neh. vii. 7).—ידלף cannot critically be derived from √דלף, 'to drop'; it may come from ירפל, *i.e.* ירפאל (see on Josh. xviii. 27).—More certain is the origin of בתואל. Like ביתאל and Bait-ili (see on xxviii. 19), it must have come from אתבול, *i.e.* ישמעאל (cp. on 1 K. xvi. 31, and on אתמול, 1 S. x. 10). So תובל, x. 2. Thus Laban and Ribḳah were both Ishmaelites, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'elites. The situation of Ḥaran, however, must be considered separately.

ראומה (Reumah) is supposed to be another survival of primitive totemism. According to Holzinger it is the רְאֵם, 'wild ox.' But how improbable that the concubine of Naḥor should have such a widely different kind of name from the concubine of Abraham! Method requires us to group ראומה with רעמה and ראמות; *i.e.* it comes from some popular form of ירחמאל.—טבח (Ṭebaḥ) may have come from רחבות (see on טבחים, xxxvii. 36). This word (= בטח, 2 S. viii. 8) illustrates the Mibtaḥ-iah of the Assuan papyri. —גחם (Gaḥam) should probably be נחם, a Maakathite name (1 Chr. iv. 19).—תחש (Taḥash) is identified by Winckler (*MVG*, 1896, p. 207) with Tiḫis, mentioned in *Pap. Anast.* i. 22 as in the region of Kadesh on the Orontes. But names have many homes. תחש, like חטוש (Ezra viii. 2) and אחוז (xxvi. 26), probably comes from אשחרת, the feminine form of אִשְׁחָר.—מעכה, *i.e.* the southern Maakah. See on Dt. iii. 14, Josh. xiii. 11, 2 S. x. 6.

ABRAHAM BUYS A GRAVE (GEN. XXIII.)

THE section before us begins with the death and ends with the burial of Sarah. But whereas a bare record is all that is given of her death and of the subsequent mourning, the elaborate narrative which follows has for its aim to prove by circumstantial evidence that Sarah was interred by Abraham in the land of Canaan as a right that had been conceded by the lords of the country. Here, as everywhere, the Priestly Writer shows himself a lover of precision. He tells how the benê Ḥeth listened graciously to Abraham's proposal to purchase, and how after courtesies given and received Ephron sold him a piece of land in which was a cave. If in an earlier form of the story the forms of legal procedure were at all fully described, the writer who finally shaped the narrative has omitted the description.[1] This narrator, at any rate, was contented with having made it clear that Abraham had secured the possession of an inalienable family-grave.[2] There is a parallel but much shorter notice in xxxiii. 18-20 (JE), where Jacob purchases a piece of land at Shechem, presumably as a place for a family-grave (see Josh. xxiv. 32).

The story in its present form has some peculiarities. Thus (1) Sarah is said to have died 'in Ḳiryath-arbaʿ, that is, Ḥebron, in the land of Canaan.' Arbaʿ in Hebrew means 'four.' Hence theories have arisen, analogous to those connected with Beer-sheba (see on xxi. 30), explaining the name Ḳiryath-arbaʿ either as 'a city of four (quarters, or

[1] Against Sayce's view that the account is in special accordance with Babylonian usages, see S. A. Cook, *The Laws of Moses*, etc., 1903, pp. 38 *f.*, 208.

[2] See W. R. Smith, *OTJC*[(2)], pp. 417 *f.*

even gods),' or as 'a city devoted to the Four-god,' *i.e.* to the moon-god, one of whose memorial symbols was four.[1] In illustration of this, Winckler compares the place-name Arbaʿ-ilu,[2] 'the Four-god city.' These theories, however, are not in themselves probable. If a numeral came in at all, we should have expected it to be three, corresponding to the three sons of Anaḳ (Num. xiii. 22, etc.). We cannot, therefore, disregard the evidence produced by textual criticisms to show that ארבע is not unfrequently miswritten either for עֲרָב or for ʿערב, *i.e.* ערבים.[3] 'City of Arabia' or 'of Arabians' would no doubt be a possible name for a place in a Yeraḥme'elite region (see on 'Mamre,' xiii. 18). The question, however, still remains whether קרית was originally the first part of the name. The appendix עֲרָב is most naturally taken as a qualification of some place-name of frequent occurrence, *i.e.* Ḳ.-arâb might mean 'Arabian Ḳiryath,' if such a place-name as Ḳiryath were well attested. Most probably, however, קרית has the same origin as כרית (1 K. xvii. 3, 5) and כרתי (1 S. xxx. 14), *i.e.* all these names arose very early[4] out of some common place-name, such as רחבות (ב omitted, ח converted into כ or ק), or, better, אשחורת (cp. אשכר = אשחר ; כרי = אשכרי, 2 K. xi. 4, 19 ; and חרת, 1 S. xxii. 5, from אשחרת). See xiv. 13 (end), where Mamre, Eshcol, and Aner are referred to as citizens of כרית ערבים, and l. 5, where Jacob refers to his grave as situated in כרית ירחמʿ (the corrections are secure) ; also on x. 14 (Kaphtorim).

It is slightly in favour of the reading Reḥoboth-ʿarâb that חברון (Ḥebron), with which Ḳiryath-arba (?) is here (as also in xxxv. 27, Josh. xiv. 15, xv. 13, 54, xx. 7, xxi. 11, Judg. i. 10, but not Neh. xi. 25) identified, may probably be connected with רחב.[5] And it is a plausible

[1] Winckler, *GI* ii. 48 ; cp. Tomkins, *Times of Abraham*, pp. 102 *f.*

[2] *I.e.* Arbela, between the upper and the lower Zâb, a seat of the cult of Ishtar. Cp. Jastrow, *RBA*, p. 203, note 1. The name may be a trace of the great Arabian migration. Cp. on ארבאל, Hos. x. 14.

[3] On miswritten numerals, see on ii. 10, xiv. 14, xv. 13, 1 K. xi. 3, Neh. vii. 68 *f.*

[4] We may infer this from Egyptian reproductions of קרית (W.M.M., *As. u. Eur.* pp. 174, 195).

[5] Cp. on רחב, Josh. ii. 1. Sayce and Hommel, however, suppose a

hypothesis that Reḥobon in course of time supplanted the older form Reḥoboth. On the whole, however, I am inclined to prefer, as the original of קרית, אשחרת. See, further, notes on xiii. 18 (more than one Ḥebron), Num. xiii. 22 (Ḥebron, east of Ṣoan-Miṣrim), and, for 'the land of Canaan,' on xi. 31.

Another remarkable feature is the presence of the benê Ḥeth in Ḥebron, which has put it into Winckler's head to transport Ḳiryath-arba to the far north of Palestine.[1] It is certainly strange to find southern Ḥittites in a Genesis narrative, but, as Sayce reminds us, in Ezek. xvi. 3, Jerusalem is tauntingly informed that her father was an Amorite and her mother a Ḥittite, from which it is inferred that ancient Jerusalem had a mixed population of Amorites and Ḥittites. It has been shown, however (on x. 16), that 'Yebūsite' comes from 'Ishmaelite.' There must have been a branch of the Ishmaelites, called corruptly 'Yebūsites,' which dwelt both at Jerusalem (Judg. i. 21) and probably (cp. 2 S. v. 6) elsewhere also. Indeed, ירושלם itself is marked out as an Ishmaelite town. As Nestle (*ZDPV* xxvii. 155) has seen, it comes from עירוש'; to complete this, let it be added that עירו possibly comes from יעיר, and שלם certainly from ישמעאל. It may also be noticed that in Josh. x. 5 the king of Ḥebron and the king of Jerusalem are both represented as 'Amorites' in MT., but are 'Yebūsites' in 𝔊. Perhaps for אמרי we should read ארמי, and similarly in Ezek. xvi. 3; 'Arammite' and 'Yebūsite' are virtually synonymous.

Accepting these results, we can understand how the so-called benê Ḥeth (*vv.* 3, 5, 7, 10, 16, 18, 20) came into the

connexion with the Ḥabiri of the Amarna letters. I would rather (with Wellhausen, *De Gentibus*, 1870, p. 27) compare the clan-name חבר. Ḥeber, in Judg. v. 25, is a Kenite name.

[1] *GI* ii. 39 *f.* It is also noted that Talmai was the name of a king of Geshur in David's time (2 S. xiii. 37). But was there not a southern Geshur (Josh. xiii. 2; see *Crit. Bib.* pp. 284, 416)? It is much more likely that a son of David would take refuge in a southern district. Cp. the southern refuge of Hadad and of Jeroboam. Both 'Geshur' and 'Talmai' were transferred Arabian names. Talmai is beyond doubt, not 'he of the furrow' (Meyer, p. 264, 'a genius of agriculture'), but from תמל (cp. תמול), *i.e.* 'Ethmaal' = 'Ishmael.'

narrative. 'Ḥittites' or 'Hethites' is = 'Ashḥartites' and 'Ḳiryath-arba' = 'Ashḥoreth-arâb.' The Ashḥartites were 'the people of the land,' and the land was probably that called Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el. We can also appreciate the statement that an important Ḥittite was called Ephron ben-Ṣoḥar, for Ṣoḥar has undoubtedly arisen out of Ashḥur (cp. on xlvi. 10), and the descriptive title ben-Ṣoḥar marks Ephron out as an Ashḥurite. The Ashḥurites or Ashḥartites were 'the people of the land' (*vv.* 7, 12, 13), or, as Ephron calls them, 'the sons of my people' (*v.* 11).

Here another problem arises. It is twofold. First, what is the text which underlies an impossible phrase in *vv.* 10, 18? and next, what is to be inferred from the recovered text?

The phrase is לכל באי שער עירו (*v.* 10), or, as in *v.* 18, בכל, and the problem is to explain how the idea of 'citizens' came (as commentators assure us that it did come) to be expressed by words meaning 'those who entered the gate of his (Ephron's?) city,' and if such an expression of that idea is impossible, to recover the underlying original text. So far as I know, no satisfactory justification of the phrase in question exists. The text, therefore, must be wrong, *i.e.* the latest redactor made the best he could of a miswritten text, and there is a close parallel to this in xxxiv. 24 (twice), where the idea of 'citizens' is commonly supposed to be expressed by 'those that went out of the gate of his (Ḥamor's) city.' It would be easy to refer to other passages in which שער, 'gate,' enters into hard and improbable phrases, *e.g.* in xxii. 17, xxiv. 60, xxxiv. 20, Mic. i. 9, Ruth iii. 11. The first three of these are treated in this work. As for the two latter passages, the reader may easily convince himself of the doubtfulness of the traditional text. Probably the right correction of שער עמי in Micah and Ruth is אַשֻּׁר ארמים, 'Asshur of the Arammites,' which may be either a district-name or a place-name. Similarly, the right correction of שער עירם and שער עירו in xxxiv. 20, 24, is אַשֻּׁר יערם[1], to which in *v.* 20 יעצי ('the counsellors of'), not יצאי, is the right prefix. It follows that באי שער עירו in *vv.* 10, 18 is a corruption of בעלי אשר יערם, 'the citizens of

[1] For יערם cp. קרית יערים = אשחרת ירחמאל, and see on xxxvi. 43.

Asshur-Yeraḥme'el'? The phrase is probably a gloss on בני חת, and states more precisely who the persons referred to were.

A new question now arises. It will be observed that in xxxiv. 20, 24, it is Ḥamor's city which is (according to the preceding criticism) called 'Asshur of the Arabians,' while in xxiii. 10, 18 the same name is given to the city inhabited by Ephron, *i.e.* Ḳiryath-arba, or rather Aṣhḥoreth-arâb. This application of the place-name 'Asshur of the Arammites' must surely be ancient. May we infer that at an early date Ashḥoreth-arâb was identified with the place commonly called Shechem, but originally (see on xii. 6) Shakram, *i.e.* Ashḥur-Arâm? Surely not. The strong probability is that in the older form of the legends more than one place was called the Arammite or Yeraḥme'elite Asshur. That Ephron's city Ḥebron should have borne this name is not surprising, for Ephron was described sometimes as a Ḥethite (Ashḥartite), sometimes as a Ṣoḥarite (Ashḥurite).

Next, as to the estate bought by Abraham. It was a field or piece of cultivated land (שדה), with a cave in it (מערה); see *vv.* 9, 11, 17, 19 *f.* We also hear of 'Makpelah (or, the Machpelah) before Mamre' (*vv.* 17, 19). What is Makpelah?[1] Clearly not a cave (𝔊, *τὸ διπλοῦν*, as if a double cavern were meant, which involves mistranslation of *vv.* 17 and 19), but the name of the district in which the 'field' with the 'cave' was situated. A clue to its meaning is supplied by פינל, xxi. 22, 32, xxvi. 26, which is presumably a corruption of אבימלך (see on xxi. 22), and by פי־בסת (Ezek. xxx. 17), *i.e.* ערב־ישמת = אבי־יבסת. Following these analogies, מכפלה ought to have come from פי־מלכה, *i.e.* ערב־מלכה. That מלך is a popular symbol of ירחמאל has often been pointed out in these researches (cp. on מלכה, xi. 29).

Another question. Did the original story relate the purchase of a cave, or simply of a piece of land? It is in a high degree probable that מערה (usually = 'cave') has often arisen out of רעמה, a popular modification of ארם (Aram = Yeraḥme'el); see on x. 7. This may conceivably have been the case in the writing from which P most

[1] 'Makpelah' only occurs in P (here and in xxv. 9, xlix. 30, l. 13).

probably borrows. If so, however, the text must have fallen into a corrupt state, and P felt obliged to recast it. To him מערה was not a miswritten form of רעמה, but meant 'cave'—a meaning not at all unsuitable where a grave was spoken of. The original text may have resembled the short account of Jacob's purchase of land in xxxiii. 18-20. The piece of land was probably called Bimalkah (cp. במהל, 1 Chr. vii. 33, from ירחם׳ עֶרֶב), and was defined as being 'before' רעמן (cp. רעמה), the probable original of ממרא (see on xiii. 18).

And now as to the purchase. In *v.* 9 Ephron is to give up the field בכסף מלא, 'for full money,' and in *v.* 15 the land is said to be worth 400 shekels in silver. These readings are most improbable. We can, however, by using our experience of recurrent types of corruption, restore a thoroughly suitable text. It so happens that מלא (Jer. iv. 12, Nah. i. 10), equally with אלם and עלם, is a well-proved corruption of ירחמאל or ישמעאל. בכסף מלא therefore, if the other references to money consist with this, should be בכסף ירח׳, a phrase which should also be restored in xx. 16 and in 1 Chr. xx. 24 (where in MT. בכסף מלא corresponds to במחיר, from ירחם׳ [בכסף] in 2 S. xxiv. 24; see *Crit. Bib.* pp. 311 *f.*). It also happens that מאת and שקל are met with as corruptions of מנת (cp. 2 Chr. ix. 16, where read מנות, comparing 1 K. x. 17, מנים) and אשכל = Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el (as in Lev. v. 15, Isa. xxxiii. 18) respectively. This suggests as the original reading in *vv.* 15 *f.*, ארבע מָנֹת כסף אשכל 'four minæ, in money of Ashkal' (*i.e.* Asshur-Yeraḥme'el; see on xiv. 13). In *v.* 16 the mention of the sum of money is followed by עבר לסחר, 'passing to the merchant,' *i.e.* as commentators say, 'current, or accepted, among the merchants.' For this explanation 2 K. xii. 5 *f.* is quoted, but wrongly. כסף עובר איש in that passage is untranslatable. There is, however, a thoroughly good remedy, and that is to restore as the underlying words כֶּסֶף עֶרֶב אַשּׁוּר.[1] The following words are a gloss; נפשות (written נפשו׳), like נפש, נפשי, and נפשו elsewhere, and like

[1] Unless עובר has come from ירובאל = ירחמאל; see further on in the text. In itself, however, the reading עֶרֶב is plausible. Cp. Cant. v. 5, where מור עבר should be מוֹר עֶרֶב, 'myrrh of Arabia.'

פישון in ii. 11 (see note), represents ישמעאל, while ארכו, like עובר, comes from ערב, 'Arabia.' It is just the same case with our passage. In two different glosses the sum paid by Abraham is described first as 'money of Ashkal,' and then (in an equivalent phrase) as 'money of Yeraḥme'el-Asshur.'[1] In short, the ל in לסחר should be attached to ערב, and we should read ירחמ' אשחר. Cp. the corrupt ארבל in Hos. x. 14, also סכר־כוש, Isa. xlv. 14, where סכר may represent אשחר, a variant to כוש.

It only remains to do one's best to correct some readings which, though ancient, are none the less impossible. Let us turn to *vv.* 5 *f.* לאמר, as in Jer. iii. 1 and elsewhere, is a corruption of ירחמאל, and לו, which (as often) represents corruptly the אל in that word, records a second attempt of the late scribe to write the name correctly (note 𝔊's reading לא, and cp. the להם which precedes לאמר at the close of Jer. ii). The next word שמענו, followed by a warning Pasek, is surely a corruption of ישמעאל (as often, ל became נ). ישמ' and ירחמ' are glosses on בני חת (cp. gloss at end of *vv.* 10, 18 indicated above).

Similarly, שמעני in *v.* 8 is most improbable. Nearly as in *v.* 6, etc., we should read ישמעאלי, a gloss on 'Ephron ben Ṣoḥar.' For 'Ephron,' see on 'Epher,' xxv. 4. 'Ṣoḥar' (צחר) comes from Ashḥur; group with חצר and צחר, and cp. on Ezek. xxvii. 18.

Several other corrections follow as a matter of course. לא שמעני in *v.* 11 (𝔊, however, presupposes לי, a corruption of לו) must be explained nearly as in a similar case in *vv.* 5 *f.* The peculiarity of the phrase in *v.* 11 is that לא is separated from שמ' by אדני. In dealing with *vv.* 5 *f.* I had to say that לא (after לאמר) represented a dittographed ירחמאל. Here, however, לא־אדני gives us both parts of ירחמ'; only the last part (לא = אל) is placed first, and ירחמ has become אדני. Read, therefore, omitting the first ירחמ' (*v.* 10, end), ירחמאל ישמעאל, a double gloss on בני חת.—In *v.* 13 לאמר לו שמ' must, of course, be similarly corrected. A gloss on עם הארץ.

But what of אך אם אתה, interposed between לאמר

[1] When good weight or measure is spoken of, it is usual to mention the standards. See on chap. xx. section (*e*), also on Hos. iii. 2.

and לו שמ׳? Does the anacoluthon express a 'courteous embarrassment' (Gunkel)? Much more probably חפץ has fallen out before אתה (1 K. xxi. 6); very possibly, too, אך has come from אד׳, *i.e.* אֲדֹנִי.—In *v.* 15 the opening words (taken with לאמר לו at the end of *v.* 14) should be corrected in accordance with words in *vv.* 10 *f.*—By way of supplement it may be added that Ephron is no ordinary 'heathen,' but, like Abimelech in chap. xx., a worshipper of Elohim, *i.e.* probably 'Yerahme'el,' who is so near of kin to Yahweh, and that נשיא אלהים in *v.* 6 means, not merely 'a mighty prince,' but 'one who has been set up on high by the god of the land'; it marks out Abraham as a natural friend of Ephron and of his clan.

THE SEARCH FOR A WIFE FOR ISAAC (GEN. XXIV.)

WHO can resist the charm of that 'gem of purest ray'—the story of the wooing and winning of Rebecca? Note above all the Homeric simplicity. We cannot, however, avoid confessing that J's work has been retouched, and that the manipulating process may have begun early. Just as in xiv. 19, 'God of Yerahme'el' has become 'God Most High,' so it is almost certain that in *v.* 7 (and in the other passages where it occurs—see on Ezra i. 2) אלהי שמים has sprung out of אלהי ישמעאל, just as שקוץ שמם in Dan. xii. 11 has come from שקוץ ישמ׳; *i.e.* ישמ׳, written short, was misread under the influence of the theory that such a title as 'God of heaven' was alone worthy of the great God Yahweh;[1] the article, of course, is redactional. Nor

[1] Sievers (*Metr. Stud.* p. 301) thinks that the formula 'God of heaven and earth' was brought by the Jews from their exile. It is, however, really due to the late redactor's manipulation of an old phrase.

is this all. The manipulator wished for a fuller confession of Yahweh's greatness, and so in *v.* 3 he has given us a still more explicit declaration of Yahweh's universal sovereignty or creatorship ('God of the heaven and God of the earth'). It is remarkable that this title occurs nowhere else in the narrative, and while I do not doubt that Yahweh, to his worshippers, was indeed the God of heaven, yet it seems to me more in accordance with the specially N. Arabian character of the original legends to suppose that here, as well as in ix. 26 and xxi. 3 (see notes), it was as the patron-God of the great Yeraḥme'elite race that the God of Abraham was originally referred to.

That this God was either developed out of, or at least existed, side by side the great mother-goddess Ashtart, must be admitted to be a very probable theory (see pp. 17, 21). In *vv.* 2, 9 of the present chapter (cp. xlvii. 29) the phrase 'put thy hand under my thigh' is used by Barton (*Sem. Or.* p. 281) as a confirmation of this view. The phrase does, in fact, indicate that the organs of reproduction were specially sacred to Yahweh. To be like Elohim was in primitive times to be capable of generating human beings. An Australian parallel occurs in George Grey's *Journals of Expeditions*, etc. (1841), ii. 342, given by Driver (from Dr. Tylor's reference) in his *Genesis* (p. 281). Not a word is needed; the position of one seated upon the thighs of the other, with his hands under them, is sufficient. Among the Arab tribes of the Sinaitic peninsula 'the plaintiff puts his hand in the defendant's girdle, and makes him repeat the name of God three times before giving his evidence.'[1]

The district to which, after such a striking formality, the representative of Abraham was sent, was, as the printed text gives the name, Aram-naharaim (*v.* 10). To this is added a second specification, which at first sight appears more precise, 'Ir-nāḥōr (the city of Naḥor). Both phrases are difficult. The former (see Dillmann) is very variously explained, and there are those who would pronounce the second element in the name 'naharîm,' corresponding to the Egyptian Naharin, *i.e.* northern Syria and the country

[1] Gordon Clark, quoting from Lord Cromer's last report on Egypt. See *Exp. Times*, xviii. 46.

eastward.[1] Of the four other passages in which the compound name appears, one is Judg. iii. 8, where the name Cushan (applied to the oppressor of Israel) points to N. Arabia; another is the title of Ps. lx., where it is mentioned with Aram-Ṣoba[2] and with Edom; the third is 1 Chr. xix. 6, where it goes with Aram-Maacah and Ṣoba; and the fourth Dt. xxiii. 5, where it is the country of Balaam's town ('Pethor'), which was certainly in the south (cp. on Num. xxii. 5, xxiii. 7). These several passages will be fully treated elsewhere, but it may be said here that the first and third sufficiently justify us in placing Aram-naharaim in the Arabian border-land, to which region also that other compound name, Paddan-aram, may reasonably be considered to point (see on xxv. 20, P). It is possible that 'Naharaim' may refer to the two border-streams which seem on textual grounds to be most clearly established, viz. those of Yarḥon and of Miṣrim, which may also not improbably have borne other names (see on xv. 18).

And what is 'Ir-nāḥōr'? Does it really mean 'the city which Naḥor, after Abraham had migrated to Canaan, still continued to inhabit, *i.e.* Haran' (Driver)? It is true, the city referred to in *v.* 11 must be Ḥaran (a southern Ḥaran, see on xi. 31). But is it clear that a natural alternative name for this place would be 'Naḥor's city'? If we sanction this thesis, it may be necessary to hold with Jensen (*ZA*, 1896, p. 300) and Zimmern (*KAT*, p. 477) that Naḥor was a god's name. When, however, we notice (*a*) how completely co-ordinated the two phrases in *v.* 10, אל-ארם נהרים and אל-עיר נחור, are, (*b*) the probability that עיר sometimes comes from ער = ערב, (*c*) the additional fact that there is an Assyrian place-name Til-naḫiri,[3] *i.e.* Tubal-naḫir,[4] one is led to conclude that Naḥor or Nahar was the name of a district or region, and that 'Arab-naḥor (not 'Ir-naḥor) was the original reading, a variant to 'Aram-naharaim.' Possibly, indeed, Naḥor was differentiated from

[1] Cp. W. M. Müller, *As. u. Eur.* pp. 249 *ff.*; Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. des Alt.* i. 219; *Gesch. Aeg.* p. 227; Hogg, *E. Bib.*, 'Aram-naharaim.'

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Zoba'; *Crit. Bib.* p. 274.

[3] Johns, *Ass. Deeds*, iii. p. 127.

[4] See *E. Bib.*, 'Tel-abib'; *Crit. Bib.* pp. 91 *f.*

Nahar ('river'), just as, most probably, Haran (xi. 27) was differentiated from Ḥaran (xi. 31). If so, something must have fallen out between *v.* 10 and *v.* 11, relative to the servant's arrival with his train at Ḥaran. See, further, on xxii. 20-24, and on xxxi. 33 (where it is proposed to read 'the God of Arâb and the God of Naḥor').

Let us now consider three other personal names. It is, of course, possible in the abstract that these names, although of N. Arabian origin, had been carried to the northern Aram by migrating Yeraḥme'elites; but the results from the preceding narratives do not seem to favour this.

First of all, let us study Ribḳah (רבקה). We cannot get to the bottom of such names without considering the tribal relations of the patriarchs, in so far as these are expressed in and by the names. In reality there is, broadly speaking, but one legend of the ancestry of the Israelites. According to this, the later people of the benê Israel was formed by the coalition of two related clans. Abraham, whose name indicates him as the representative of the tribe which was at home in Arab-Yeraḥme'el, marries Sarai, whose name marks her out as the representative of the closely-related tribe which dwelt in the district of Asshur (Ashḥur). Isaac, *i.e.* probably an Ashḥurite tribe, unites with an as yet unknown figure. Jacob, *i.e.* a Yeraḥme'elite tribe, unites with Rachel and Leah, *i.e.* with another Yeraḥme'elite tribe[1] (both names having sprung from fragments of 'Yeraḥme'el'); but tradition also gives 'Jacob' the name of 'Israel,' acquired apparently through a forcible fusion of Jacob or Yeraḥme'el with a tribe called 'Israel' or, more correctly, Asshurel (an Asshurite tribe, therefore). The common idea of all these stories (putting aside for the moment that of Isaac) is that the benê Israel arose through a combination of tribes of Yeraḥme'elites and Ashḥurites. The name of Isaac's wife ought therefore to be one which expresses in some form the concept of a Yeraḥme'elite tribe, and the question arises, Are there any of the current popular corruptions of 'Yeraḥme'el' which throw light on the name Ribḳah? To justify an affirma-

[1] Steuernagel too, though on different grounds, holds that originally only one wife was assigned to Jacob (*Einwanderung*, p. 39).

tive answer, let me quote בכר, רכב, and ברק, all of which (if analogy is our guide) are closely akin to רקם, *i.e.* ירחמאל (see on בכר, xlvi. 21). It follows that רבקה is a strictly Yerahme'elite name, and it is in harmony with this that Ribkah is the daughter of Bethuel (Tubal, *i.e.* Ishmael), whose mother bears the Yerahme'elite name Milkah (xi. 29), and that Laban, and therefore also Ribkah, are natives of the land of the benê Rekem, *i.e.* Yerahme'el; see on xxix. 1.

It may perhaps be objected that it is P who makes Ribkah the daughter of Bethuel, 'Bethuel' in *vv.* 24, 47, 50, as also in xxii. 23, being probably (with whatever belongs to it) an interpolation, while the older narrator (J) makes Laban and Ribkah the children of Nahor (cp. xxix. 5, 'Laban ben Nahor'). But P does not write out of his own head. The earlier writer on whom he depends most probably held that Bethuel, *i.e.* Tubal or Ishmael, and Nahor were alternative names of the same district, and since Tubalite ('son of Tubal') and Nahorite ('son of Nahor') were equivalent, preferred the former, as the more intelligible.

The name Laban (לבן) is not so easy to explain as it may seem. Does it really mean 'white,' and is it adopted from the Harranian moon-god?[1] And does Laban the shepherd correspond to the moon as shepherd of the stars? It would be strange indeed, for the other patriarchal names in these Genesis narratives are not (so far as we have seen) divine names or titles. Nor can we separate this name from the place-names לבן (Dt. i. 1), לבנה and לבונה (Josh. x. 29, Judg. xxi. 19), the personal or rather clan-names לבני (Ex. vi. 17, 1 Chr. vi. 17), and the well-known name of a mountain-range לבנון. It is most natural to hold that all these names have arisen out of a great tribal name 'Laban,' whose eponym is the 'Laban ben Nahor,' or 'Laban the Arammite' of our narratives. A name Lapana is preserved in the Amarna tablets (139, 35, 37), and we

[1] Schrader, *KAT*(2), on Gen. xxvii. 43; Jensen, *ZA*, 1896, p. 298; cp. Goldziher, *Heb. Myth.* p. 158; Winckler, *GI* ii. 57. Dr. J. P. Peters, with a light heart, adopts this view (*Early Heb. Story*, p. 170). On 'Laban' see further *E. Bib.*, 'Laban'; 'Rachel,' § 2.

have elsewhere (see on vi. 4) seen reason to think that the נפלים of tradition owe their name, equally with the נבל of 1 S. xxv. 3, etc., to slight phonetic corruption of לבנ[ים]. As a compensation for the loss of a supposed lunar god among the patriarchs, let me point out some fresh occurrences of the name of the friendly director of human affairs, Mal'ak (see on xvi. 7).

They can, indeed, as I think, hardly be overlooked, if we direct a trained eye to the text of *vv.* 7 and 40. In *v.* 7 (MT.) the patriarch says to his trusty slave, 'he (*i.e.* Yahweh) shall send his messenger before thee, that thou mayest fetch a wife for my son from thence.' Nothing is said expressly of the fulfilment of the promise; as Gunkel points out, the divine action is presupposed and not directly brought before us—a mark of the relatively late origin of the narrative. Presumably the fortunate concatenation of circumstances is to be taken as a proof that the promise was carried out. This is perfectly right, but when elsewhere Gunkel remarks that later writers did not like to say that Yahweh himself accompanied the patriarchs on their journeys, and substituted an inferior divine being—a 'messenger,'—he is not strictly accurate. He ought at least to have added that the name of this 'messenger' had fallen out or been omitted. But the fact is that the name of the servant's protector still exists, underlying מלאכו, and that he is no inferior deity. The case is parallel to that of the famous passage, Ex. xxiii. 23, where, instead of 'my messenger,' we should most probably read Yeraḥme'el (or even 'Michael,' which need not be so late as is usually supposed). This may be shown by Ex. xiv. 19, where the protective function of 'going before' Israel is assigned to מלאך האלהים, *i.e.* (see again on chap. xvi.) Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh. Of course, when Yahweh is speaking, it could not be said 'Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh shall go before thee,' because, to human appearance, the speaker separates himself for the time from the second member of the divine duad (or triad). And for a similar reason, in xxiv. 7, Yahweh could not be represented as sending Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh before the servant of Abraham. The patriarch might have said, 'Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh . . . shall go before thee,' but with

unerring instinct the original narrator preferred the less startling statement, 'Yahweh . . . shall send Michael before thee, that thou mayest fetch a wife for my son.' After all, though Michael (Yeraḥme'el) was not a mere messenger—for all matters were settled by the divine council,—yet, if represented as separate from Yahweh, he could not but be said to be commissioned by Yahweh.[1]

Another corroboration of the Arabian theory is furnished by *v.* 55. The interest of the passage for most scholars lies in the supposed reference to the division of the month into decades (see *E. Bib.*, 'Month,' § 6). The text has, 'Let the damsel remain with us יָמִים אוֹ עָשׂוֹר.' The phrase is, at any rate, peculiar.[2] The prevalent view that עשור may be used for 'a decade' is against usage; it can only mean 'the tenth day of the month,' or, at any rate, 'the last day of the decade.' But for a moment suppose it otherwise, and let the words be taken to mean what even Kautzsch thinks they do mean—'let the damsel remain with us some days or ten,' or, as Ball prefers, 'a month or (at least) ten days'; is this natural? Why trouble the servant with an alternative period? At this point we must begin to criticise the text. או עשור being exegetically impossible, may it not be corrupt? And the answer is, Certainly, if we can show that similar corruptions have been traced elsewhere. And this we can show. Similar mistakes to that of עשור for אשור abound. The most complete parallels to the present case are perhaps in Am. iii. 12, where ערש should be אַשֶּׁר, a gloss on the preceding word דמשק (as to which see on xv. 2), in Am. i. 1 and Zech. xiv. 5, where הרעש has come from אשחור (= אשור). There are also some passages (*e.g.* Ps. lv. 4) where a stronger sense is produced by reading אַשֶּׁר instead of רָשָׁע. As for או, it is not uncommon to find a simple ו where we should expect הוא (= that is), introducing a gloss. If so, we could

[1] In *v.* 40 Gunkel alters the text, and reads, 'Yahweh, who has walked before me.' But this effaces the distinction between 'Yahweh' and 'Mal'ak-Yahweh,' and the reason for the change seems to me very trifling.

[2] 𝔊 ἡμέρας ὡσεὶ δέκα; Sam. ימים או חדש; Pesh. only expresses חדש ימים. Olsh. and Ball, חדש ימים או ע'.

not be surprised to find אר occurring once instead of הוא. (The case, however, does in fact occur a second time, viz. in Isa. xxvii. 4, where we should read הוא (not אר); but here the pronoun does not indicate a gloss.) Thus we get the gloss הוא אשור, 'that is, Asshur.' And if we may consider that the חדש of Sam. (instead of the עשור of MT.) is a various reading, it is obviously a confirmation of our view, for חדש, like חרש in Josh. ii. 1, חרס in Judg. i. 35, viii. 13, Isa. xix. 18 (v. l. הרס), חדשי in 2 S. xxiv. 6, and חדש itself in Hos. v. 7 and perhaps elsewhere, both can, and in this particular setting must, represent אַשְׁחֹר; now אַשֹּׁר and אַשְׁחֹר are slightly different forms of the same name of a N. Arabian district.

The gloss which we have now recovered—viz. 'that is, Asshur'—was inserted, after having suffered corruption, in the wrong place. Originally it stood in the margin. The redactor probably read עד-עשור, 'unto the tenth day (of the current month),' and finding a reference in *v.* 55 to a postponement of Ribḳah's journey, he foisted עד ע׳ into the text there.

But this is not the whole solution of the textual problem. Is it not highly improbable that the redactor would insert these two words in the *middle* of a sentence? Let us then look at the rest of *v.* 55, which may, very likely, turn out to be a transformation of something connected with עד עשור.

As the traditional text (MT. and 𝔊) now stands, *v.* 55 closes with אחר תלך[ו]. Now, though this phrase is strangely short and ambiguous, we should not stumble at it, but for the discovery that the preceding words are a corruption of a gloss. Very possibly, therefore, this phrase too may be corrupt. Certainly ו, as noted above, often represents הוא, 'that is,' and אחר (like אחד) often represents אשחר, and תלך, like תליך in xxvii. 3, may easily have come from תבל (Tubal in MT.), a form of Ethbaal = Ishmael. The two closing words may therefore have come from הוא אש׳ אתב׳, 'that is, Ashḥur-Ethbaal,' and it would, I think, be inconsistent not to adopt this well-founded theory.

Returning now to ימים, it is surely both justifiable and expedient to point יֹמִים (Hos. vi. 2). The sense then becomes, 'And her brother and her mother said, 'Let the

damsel remain two days.' Sievers (p. 304) has already suggested this reading, which, however, is here offered independently of his great work. But אר עשור he fails to make plausible. 'Two days or a decade' (assuming 'decade' to be possible) can, in spite of 𝔊, hardly mean 'about ten days.' As we have seen, the verse closes with a twofold gloss, 'that is, Asshur; that is, Ashḥur-Ethbaal,' which is misplaced, and belongs to *v.* 62 (see below).

Another problem. Where was Isaac when he met Ribḳah and her escort? The latter would naturally journey back to Ḥebron. Nothing is said of this in our present text of *vv.* 62-67. *V.* 62, however, is, by common admission, corrupt, and the only question is, how to correct it, having equal regard to critical method and to the requirements of the whole context. בא מבוא becomes in Sam. בא במדבר (implied too by 𝔊). But this is plainly wrong; cp. Num. xxi. 18, where MT. has ממדבר, but 𝔊 presupposes מבאר (which many prefer). In our passage מבאר is preferable to במדבר; the באר which follows is dittographed.[1] It is true, we expect to be told not only whence Isaac came, but whither he went. And our text, if treated by the right methods, meets our expectation. In *v.* 55 we have already found a misplaced gloss. Let it be added that in *v.* 63 another misplaced word exists—a word which, without experience of similar phenomena elsewhere, no one could possibly account for, but which we are now happily able to explain. The word is לָשׂוּחַ (for לָשִׂיחַ). What can this mean? To complain (to God)? To meditate? To pray? To cut brushwood? No; the word is unintelligible (Kautzsch). Hence Gesenius (and perhaps Pesh.) would read לָשׂוּט, 'to go about,' 'to make a tour of inspection.' But no such information is required. It suffices to know that Isaac went out into the country towards evening. The word referred to is (1) misplaced, and (2) corrupt. And what can שוח come from? Can we hesitate? In xxv. 2 ש׳ is a corruption of אשחור. Most probably it is so here; read, therefore, לאשחור, and restore this to its original place in *v.* 62 after ריצ׳ בא.

Now, too, we can understand the misplaced gloss of

[1] So Lagarde; 'librarius duas literas repetivit.'

which the correct form is הוא אשור הוא אִשְׁחֻר־תבל (see on *v.* 55). It relates most probably to the corrupt לשוח. *V.* 62 should therefore run thus, 'Now Isaac had come to Ashḥur [that is, Asshur; that is, Ashḥur-Ethbaal] from Beer-Yeraḥme'el; indeed, he dwelt in the land of the Negeb.' *V.* 62 *b* accounts for the mention of Beer-Yeraḥme'el, which is here placed in the Negeb. By Ashḥur, or Ashḥur-Ethbaal, is meant the city of Ephron, respecting the various names of which see on chap. xxiii. The death of Abraham seems to have called Isaac to the place where his father had dwelt. Here he remained till the return of Abraham's servant with Ribḳah. When the caravan appeared he was taking the air at evening in the open country. Whether the period of mourning for his father was over, we are not told; even the death of Abraham is omitted, and according to Wellhausen (*CH*, pp. 29 *f.*) the original אביו in *v.* 67 *b* has been changed by a redactor into אִמּוֹ.[1]

I cannot myself, however, follow Wellhausen. Indeed, I question whether this scholar has seen the whole problem. That אמו is wrong, I admit; but is אביו right? Ball (p. 79) tries to help by inserting מות before אביו. But this is too bold, and still leaves אחרי, which is wrong (we expect עַל). Both these scholars omit שרה אמו in *v.* 67 *a* as a marginal gloss. But what an unnecessary gloss! And are we sure about האהלה? If a tent is mentioned at all, it *ought* to be the wife's own tent (xxxi. 33). It is certain, however, that אהל sometimes (*e.g.* in iv. 20) comes from an imperfectly written ירחמאל; and possible that אמו may have come from עמו׳, *i.e.* עמון, and שרה from שחר[א]. I would therefore read [אשחר עמון] ירחמאלה ו׳ יצ׳, 'and Isaac brought her to Yeraḥme'el [Ashḥur-Ammon].' At the end of *v.* 67 comes the same geographical gloss dittographed (אחרי, as often, = אִשְׁחוּר). The reader will remember that Isaac is residing temporarily at Ephron's city, called sometimes Ashhur-Yerahme'el (see above).

[1] *V.* 66 implies that Abraham has passed away; otherwise, why is there no report to Abraham? Gunkel, who supposes two recensions of the story, thinks that one of these read אביו, 'his father,' instead of אמו, 'his mother,' in *v.* 67.

It only remains to note briefly that in *v.* 35 the absurd 'camels and asses' should be corrected as proposed on xii. 16 (cp. on xxx. 43), and that in *v.* 60, for את שער שנאיו, we should most probably read את אֲשֶׁר ישמעאל. Cp. on xxii. 17. It is, of course, a region, not a city, which is here referred to.

SONS OF KEṬURAH; DEATH OF ABRAHAM (GEN. XXV. 1-6, 7-11 *a*)

THE first of these passages (*vv.* 1-6) is not consistent with chap. xxiv. It speaks of a second wife and more children of Abraham, whereas in chap. xxiv. Abraham is near his end[1] and has only one son. Here, however, we are told of a second wife or concubine (see *v.* 6, 1 Chr. i. 32, and cp. xvi. 3, P, where Hagar is called אִשָּׁה), whose sons are either eleven, if (with Gunkel) we omit the names ending in ם or ים (*v.* 3 *b*), or sixteen. As to the name Keṭurah, Wellhausen (*CH*, p. 29, note 1) makes it another name for Hagar. One would rather suggest (after Holz.) that 'Abraham' may have been substituted for 'Ishmael.' It is more important, however, to explain the name Keṭurah. Glaser (*Skizze*, ii. 450) finds in it a reference to the ancient road of the Minæan incense-merchants. But if the parallel name Basemath (xxvi. 34) has come from a popular corruption of the name of a N. Arabian district or region, and if 'Ishmael' has sometimes, or even often, become שמן (misinterpreted 'oil'), we may presume that 'Keṭurah' had originally nothing to do with incense, but referred to a district. Plainly the name should be grouped with קרתה, קרתן, נרית, and perhaps even תרהקה, תרתק, טרח. All these

[1] Cp. preceding note.

possibly, and almost certainly the three first mentioned, come from אשחרת. That Abraham should have an 'Ashḥartite' wife or concubine is not unnatural (cp. on 'Ḳiryath-arba,' xxiii. 2).

Turning to the names of the 'sons' (cp. articles in *E. Bib.*), I remark with some surprise that Ed. Meyer (pp. 313-322) repeats the old errors. 'Leummim,' to him, still means 'peoples'; Leṭushim is 'surely connected with √לטש, "to sharpen"'; 'Asshurim' is not to be illustrated by 2 S. ii. 9, because 'Ashuri' there is, 'I suppose universally,' regarded as a scribe's error. Elsewhere (p. 541) it is even called 'absurd.' Let readers of Ed. Meyer beware. 'Zimran,' he says, is from זמר, 'a kind of stag.' An investigation of the passages in which 'Zimri' occurs may put us on a better track. Unless 1 Chr. ii. 6 (a passage which is not adequately appreciated by Meyer, p. 300), be an exception, all the passages suggest that the name is of N. Arabian origin. It harmonises with this that in an early Babylonian text we find the name Zimri-ḫammu, which is a transferred N. Arabian name, meaning Zimri-Yarḥam (cp Ḫammu-rabi, Yarḥam-arâb). We need not therefore appeal to the discoveries of Doughty, Euting, and Huber pointing to the (quite late) occupation of Central Arabia by Aramaic tribes.

Yoḳshan appears in $\mathfrak{G}^{EL}$ as *ιεκταν*, *i.e.* יקטן (so Tuch and Meyer), which comes from אֲשֶׁר ירחמ׳ (see on x. 25); ט is miswritten for ת = ש. 'Kishon,' 'Achish,' 'Cush,' may be compared.—*Ishbaḳ*; cp. Shobeḳ, Ishbaḥ; also perhaps Semachiah, Sibbecai.—*Shuaḥ.* Meyer has not observed that Del. has retracted his identification with the Mesopotamian Suḫi (*Hiob*, p. 139). Shuḥah (1 Chr. iv. 11) is a Calebite name, derived from אשחור.—*Sheba* and *Dedan*, in x. 7, are sons of Ra'amah (Yeraḥme'el); in x. 28, Sheba is a son of Yoḳṭan. No serious difference exists.

Now as to the (probably) interpolated clause, *v.* 3 *b.* The *Asshurim*, so troublesome to Meyer, are a branch of the tribe or race—once very widely extended—of Asshur or Ashḥur. Cp. on 'Shur' and 'Asshur,' *v.* 18; also on 'Sheba, Asshur,' Ezek. xxvii. 23.—*Leṭushim* (cp. on לטש, iv. 22), comes from Ashtulim or (1 Chr. ii. 53) Eshtaulim,

for the origin of which see on iv. 25. Possibly the closing syllable of these first two names should be, not *îm*, but *âm*. —*Leummim*, either from ירחמאלים or from ישמעאלים, as probably in Ps. vii. 8, lxv. 8. See *E. Bib.*, 'Letushim and Leummim,' and cp. on מלא, xxiii. 9.—*Ephah*, in 1 Chr. ii. 46, Caleb's concubine.—*Epher* (עפר), see on אפרים, xli. 51.—*Ḥanôk*, see on v. 18.—אבידע probably = עֵרֶב ידע. For אבי, see on xxxiii. 19; for the N. Arabian name ידע, on 2 K. xi. 4.—אלדעה, perhaps from בעלידע. בעל in names may represent the second part of ישמ' or ירחמ'.—*V.* 6 tells us that Abraham, in his lifetime, sent the sons of his concubines to the land of Reḳem (ירחם = רקם); קדמה and ארץ ק' are variants. Among these sons is Midian (see on xxxvii. 28).

With regard to xxv. 7-11 *a* (P) observe—(*a*) in *v.* 7 the corrupt, unbiblical אשר חי (see on v. 5), which should rather be אשחור, a gloss on ארץ רקם, *v.* 6, revised text (cp. on *v.* 18); and (*b*) the recognition, *v.* 9, of Isaac and Ishmael as both sons of Abraham.

THE TRIBES OF ISHMAEL (GEN. XXV. 12-17, P, 18, J)

THERE were probably twelve tribes of Ishmael (cp. xvii. 20, P) before there were twelve of Israel; see *E. Bib.*, 'Tribes,' § 5. Israel was younger than Ishmael.

It is rather strange to read 'the names . . . by their names.' Here certainly is an error which ought to be, but has not yet been, corrected. It occurs again in xxxvi. 40, and lies in בשמתם, which, following אלה שמות, is a superfluity such as even P cannot safely be accused of (cp. Gunkel). Both here and in xxxvi. 40 it is a development of בשם, *i.e.* עֵרֶב ישמעאל (see on 'Basemath,'

xxvi. 34), a geographical gloss. A scribe mistook בשמ (finals slowly became general) for בשמ'.—אדבאל, the name of an Arab chief, temp. Tiglath-Pileser III.[1] (*KAT*,[3] pp. 58, 145), probably from אֵדֶד and מאל[ירח].—מבשם and משמע, expansions of בשם (see above) and שמע (= ישמ') respectively.—דומה, connected with אדום? Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Dumah.'—משא, apparently mentioned by Tiglath-Pileser III. with Tema. An Ishmaelite name (see on מַשָּׂא, x. 30).—חֲדַד, probably = הדד and אדד; cp. on Num. xxvi. 33 (צלפחד).—יִטּוּר, to be grouped with יתרו (Ex. iii. 1), יתר (Ex. iv. 18), יתיר (Josh. xv. 48), but also with אטד, or rather אטר (l. 10), אטר (Ezra ii. 16), and names in Assyrian deeds such as Atar-ḥamu, Atar-kamu, etc.[2] As in the case of the goddess Atar-samain, Atar = 'Athtar = Ashtar. Cp. also Nabatæan ותרא (Cooke, p. 245). The men of Yetûr were Ashtarites (cp. on Dt. i. 4).—נפיש; cp. on 'Nephisim' (Ezra ii. 50). The origin, of course, was soon forgotten; but certainly it is an early corruption of ישפן (cp. שפן, 2 K. xxii. 3, 12), *i.e.* ישבן (cp. שבניה, etc.) = ישמן, *i.e.* ישמעאל; cp. צפון = צבעון = ישמ'. Cp. on xxiii. 15, Judg. v. 18, 21.—קדמה. Cp. קדמות, Dt. ii. 26, etc.; הר הקדם, x. 30; ארץ קדם, xxv. 6; הקדמני, xv. 19.—קדם is an early modification of רקם = ירחם.

V. 18 (J), which R no doubt meant as the sequel of *v.* 16, is 'full of difficulties' to the prevalent criticism, 'for the geographical data do not seem reconcilable' (*Oxf. Hex.* ii. 37 *a*). From our point of view, however, it must be clear (see on xvi. 7, and *Crit. Bib.* on 1 S. xv. 7, xxvii. 8) that since (1) Amalek is undoubtedly a popular corruption of Yeraḥme'el, and (2) Ishmael and Yeraḥme'el are equivalent, the account given of the tribal limits of Amalek must agree with that given of those of Ishmael. It is plain, too, that in 1 S. xv. 7 and xxvii. 8 (see *Crit. Bib.*) מצרים should be read Miṣrim; the Amalekite and the Miṣrite regions were contiguous (see on 1 S. xxx. 9 *ff.*).[3] Hence in Gen. xxv. 18

[1] The 'Muṣri' spoken of is the N. Arabian, as Winckler has shown (*Hibbert Journal*, ii. 581, April 1904).

[2] See Johns, *Ass. Deeds*, index, p. 551, and cp. Zimmern, *KAT*[3], pp. 434 *f.*

[3] There are few things in the MT. more improbable than the

it would be the height of rashness to read מצרים 'Miṣraim' (Egypt).[1] Of course, the scribe who wrote 'Asshur' was not the same who wrote 'Shur.' באכה אשור is a gloss, and *v.* 18 *b* is a gloss upon this very gloss, derived from xvi. 12. The first to recognise that the Asshur spoken of is in N. Arabia was Hommel (*AHT*, pp. 240 *f.*), though he misunderstands both מצרים and the closing words (על-פני וגו׳); the former he reads Miṣraim, and the latter על-פני כלֶח, '(that is) before Kelaḥ' (see on x. 11). Under the influence of xvi. 12 (the text of which is left) this became what we now read in MT. The objection to this view is twofold. (1) xvi. 12 *b* and xxv. 18 *b* are both corrupt and must be explained together. (2) נפל, 'fell,' *i.e.* 'settled,' is as impossible as כל אחיו. Experience of the recurrent types of textual corruption will alone enable us to correct these errors. אחיו, as in xvi. 12 *b* (see note), has come from אַשְׁחוּר (a fuller form of Asshur, not noticed by Hommel). As for נפל (Krochmal and Grätz guess נָפֵץ), we must look out for some name that can be combined with Ashḥur. Lapana, mentioned in *Am. Tab.* 139, 35. 57, in the land of Ubi (Damascus?), may be the right name; it is probably = Laban (see on xxiv. 29). Thus *v.* 18 *b* will run thus, 'in front of all Ashḥur-lapan.' 'Lapanites,' by an easy corruption, became 'Niphlites' (see on 'Nephilim,' vi. 4).

sentence, 'I am a young man of Egypt, the slave of an Amalekite' (see *Bible Problems*, 1904, p. 170). I look in vain for a real explanation of this.

[1] A Dutch scholar (A. Noordtzij), however, actually says, 'The expression "before Egypt" is only accurate if Egypt is intended.' He refers to 'the map,' and compares Ex. xv. 22, Gen. xx. 1. See *Th. Ti.*, 1906, p. 392. I should like to see that wonderful map.

STORY OF ESAU AND JACOB (GEN. XXV. 19-34)

P's introduction (*vv.* 19 *f.*) to the Isaac-section is followed by J's account of the birth and upbringing of Esau and Jacob, with a small interwoven fragment of P (*v.* 26 *b*).

First as to the twins and their struggling in the womb. How large a place twins occupy in mythologies—suggested by the heavenly twins[1]—is well known. Dr. Rendel Harris's recent book on the Cult of the Twins exempts me from the duty of seeking after completeness. I may, however, mention a Polynesian parallel to the story before us, taken from a creation-myth of Mangaia. Tangaroa (see p. 9) and Rongo are the twins; the former should have been born first, but gave precedence to his brother Rongo.[2] And just as Esau is favoured by Isaac, and Jacob by Ribḳah, so Tangaroa is the favourite of his father Vatea, and Rongo of his mother Papa. Tangaroa was the cleverer, and instructed his brother Rongo in the arts of agriculture. A still more complete parallel is the story of Akrisios and Proitos, sons of Abas, king of Argos, who began their rivalry in their mother's womb.[3] In Egyptian mythology the nearest parallel is the birth-story of the divine brothers Osiris and Set-Typhon.[4] They were not indeed twins, being born, the one on the first, the other on the third of the 'additional days' (ἡμ. ἐπαγομέναι), but equally with Esau and Jacob they belong to the class of hostile brothers, so

[1] The original heavenly twins were surely the sun and moon.

[2] Gill, *Myths and Songs from the S. Pacific*, p. 10 (quoted by Stucken, p. 232).

[3] Apollod. *Biblioth.* ii. 2, 1 (Stucken, p. 200). Cp. also the story of Kronos and Rhea (Hesiod, *Theog.* 467-476), also adduced by Stucken).

[4] See Maspero, *Dawn of Civ.* pp. 172, 208.

well represented in myths.[1] Of Typhon, Plutarch (*De. Is.* c. 12) relates, 'neither in due time, nor in the right place, but breaking through with a blow, he leaped out through his mother's side,' and a similar story is told of the birth of the Vedic god Indra.[2] For this we have a closer Hebrew parallel in the birth-story of the twins Pereṣ and Zeraḥ (xxxviii. 27-30; see note).

We see from this how the early Hebrew stories grew up. Features of mythic origin attached themselves to personages who had not, so far as we can now see, a mythic origin. Had we the Hebrew stories in a more complete and a more original form, we might be able to reproduce the underlying myths. It is something, however, to discern how these strange features in the stories of the patriarchs arose. Naturally the oracle interprets the struggling in the womb as an omen of a feud between the brothers.

In P's highly characteristic contribution we meet with the new and strange geographical name Paddan-aram. Its meaning, according to Winckler, is doubtful, but it is certainly not = Mesopotamia (*GI* ii. 51). The more familiar name 'Aram-naharaim' has already (see on xxiv. 10) been shown to point most probably to the southern Aram, *i.e.* some part of the N. Arabian border-land. As to 'Paddan,' our safest course is to group it with those other O.T. names of which *pd* forms the kernel (see on Num. i. 10), and with the Assyrian names Padi and Paddû-ili, and the Punic פדי.[3] Nor must we ignore the fact that פדון in Ezra ii. 44 is combined with קרס and סיעהא, both ultimately corruptions of אשחור; also that פדהצור (Num. i. 10) has probably come from פד אשחור. Paddan was therefore presumably in Asshur-Yeraḥme'el. We may confirm this by Hos. xii. 12; the present text is plainly wrong, but underneath it we can see 'and Jacob fled to the field of Aram, and Israel served in Ashḥur (אשה from 'אשח), and in Ashḥur he was preserved (נשמר)'; *i.e.* Aram (Yeraḥme'el) and Ashḥur are parallel, equivalent names for the region where Jacob sojourned with

[1] Cp. Cain and Abel, Romulus and Remus, Joskeha and Tawiscara (Iroquois of N. America).

[2] Oldenberg, *Relig. des Veda*, p. 134, note 3.

[3] See Johns, *Ass. Deeds*, iii. 238.

Laban. We may also mention the problem of the title of a Cassite king of Babylonia, 'king of Padan and Alman' (Hommel, *Gr.* p. 190). Do these names come from Arabia?

We now pass on to J's portion. We must, as usual, give our best attention both to the names and to J's explanations of the names; the latter may turn out to be suggestive. The names are Esau, Jacob, Seir, and Edom. עשו (Esau) is taken to mean 'hairy, shaggy';[1] if this is correct, there must, according to analogies, have been a district to which the name 'hairy,' *i.e.* perhaps 'wooded,' was applied. Now there was certainly a district called in very ancient times[2] by the name שעיר (Seir), and it is just conceivable that עשו and שעיר may be synonymous and refer to the same district.[3] Unfortunately we cannot be at all sure that שעיר originally meant 'hairy,' (1) because the allusion to this meaning in xxvii. 11, coming from an old Hebrew writer, is more likely to be wrong than right, and beside it in *v.* 16 there stands (as Gunkel supposes) an allusion to the possible meaning 'goat'; (2) because, now at any rate, Seir is for the most part barren (Nöldeke, *E. Bib.*, col. 1184), and (3) because analogy requires that שעיר as a geographical name should be a curtailed form of some longer and more widely-spread name. What that longer name is we can hardly fail to see. For several reasons it is most probably אַשּׁוּר; note especially how often in the MT. שער has come from אשור or אשחור (see on xxii. 17).

Now if the origin of שעיר may, on grounds of analogy, be traced to אשור, so also may that of עשו.[4] In the case of neither word can any stress safely be laid on שׁ. There is a group of related names, such as יעשׂו, יעשׂיאל, עשׂיאל, עשׂיה, in

[1] On doubtful philological grounds (see *E. Bib.*, col. 1333, note 3). Aware of this, Driver (p. 246) and Hommel (*Gr.* p. 164, note 3, but cp. p. 167, note 3) would read 'Eshau instead of 'Esau.

[2] See the famous passage in the Harris papyrus (Rameses III.), and cp. W. M. M. *As. u. Eur.* pp. 135 *f.* 240.

[3] That Esau and Seir are closely connected geographically is plain from xxxvi. 8 and Dt. ii. 5, 8.

[4] Cp. on Dt. iii. 17 (עשתר and אשתר equivalent), and for the curtailment of עשור into עשו cp. שוא from אשור in Isa. v. 20, xxx. 28. In xxv. 34 (see below) a gloss informs us that 'Esau' is = 'Ashtar.'

all of which[1] עשׂי seems to have come from אשור, while עשׂה in עשׂהאל has probably come from אשחר (cp. אשׂה from אשח' in Hos. xii. 12). We can now understand still better how Esau and Seir, and Seir and the Ḥorites respectively, came to be so closely linked, and also how Esau and Jacob came to be represented as brothers. All these names except the last come from Asshur or (in the case of Ḥor) Ashḥur, while the last (יעקב) ultimately goes back to ירחם. See on xxxii. 28, and note that the current explanations, 'He follows' or 'He rewards,' imply an exaggerated confidence in the persistence of the original forms of Hebrew names. On the supposed parallel to *v.* 26 *a* in Hos. xii. 4 *a*, see on xxxii. 23-33.

May we connect 'Esau' with the Usöos of Philo of Byblus (Eus. *Præp. Ev.* i. 10. 10? A direct connexion is plausible but unsafe. So far as legendary details go, there is not much similarity between them, and Usöos is much more probably either the personification of the city of Ušu[2] (Palætyrus) or the Græcised form of עשיו, *i.e.* Ashḥur. Thus an indirect connexion of Usöos with Esau may perhaps be admitted. The name of his brother Samem-rūmos may also be indirectly connected with Jacob, *i.e.* Yerahme'el, for 'Samem' almost certainly represents ישמעאל (see p. 18, note 1, and cp. on xxiv. 3), and 'rūm' comes from אֲרָם, so that the whole name is = Ishmael-aram.

Next, as to J's explanation of 'Esau' (*v.* 25). According to MT. it runs thus—'and the first came out ruddy, all of him like a hair-mantle; so his name was called Esau.' It should be plain, in spite of Winckler,[3] that אדמני cannot mean 'shaggy.' Hence either אד' must have displaced some word meaning 'shaggy' (so Budde),[4] or כאדרת שער needs critical correction, so as to produce the meaning 'like a *red* garment.' The former view is unnatural, for there is no word meaning 'shaggy' that at all resembles אד', and a violent substitution of one word for another is most improbable. שער, however, may without violence be corrected, so as to

[1] Cp. the name עשיו on a Hebrew seal (Cooke, p. 362).
[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Esau,' § 1; 'Hosah,' and cp. Hommel, *Gr.* pp. 166 *f.*
[3] *AOF* i. 344 *f.*; cp. Jeremias, *ATAO*, p. 235.
[4] *Die bibl. Urgeschichte* (1883), p. 217, note 2.

produce the required sense. How often do we find שער miswritten for אשר (see on xxii. 17, xxiii. 10, xxiv. 60)! To justify this let me remark (1) that we are now concerned with a professed explanation of the name עשו, *i.e.* אשור, and (2) that (if I am not much mistaken) coloured stuffs are repeatedly spoken of in the true text of the O.T. as special commodities of Ishmaelite (Yerahme'elite) or Asshurite Arabia. Thus, it was a 'mantle of Shinar' (*i.e.* of Ishmael-Arabia; see on x. 10) that Achan coveted under Joshua (see on Josh. vii. 21), and a difficult phrase in Am. ii. 8 should probably be understood as 'Ḥabulite (*i.e.* Yerahme'elite) garments.' Lastly, in Ezek. xxxiii. 5 *f.* we find the Asshurites referred to as clothed in blue-purple, and in xxvii. 7 (rev. text), blue-purple and red-purple are spoken of as coming from Ishmaelite Arabia.[1]

These facts make it reasonable to suppose that the colour of Esau's, *i.e.* of Asshur's, skin is compared to that of mantles such as were known far and wide through the Arabian merchants. The 'red-purple' of such mantles suggested a comparison for the ruddy skin and blue veins of an infant. The figure derived an additional fitness from the fact that these mantles were 'mantles of Asshur,'[2] which supplied a fresh reason for the child's being called 'Asshur.'

It is customary to find a strong dash of humour in the description in *v.* 25. 'In those witticisms,' says Peters,[3] 'one sees before him just the type of wild Edomite which Israel held up to laughter as Esau. The open shirt displays a breast so hairy that it looks like a goat's beard hanging down. The hairy legs below the short shirt might pass for a satyr's limbs. The hair of the head'—but why should I continue? The description is quite out of place as an illustration of *v.* 25. Esau is not here represented as

[1] For 'Ishmael' the text has 'Elishah'; cp. x. 4, 'Elishah and Tarshish' (Ishmael and Ashtar).

[2] The phrase ארת שער occurs again only in Zech. xiii. 4, where the reading seems correct; the characteristic garment of a prophet is meant. But how strange it would be if the child Esau were said to have looked altogether like a little prophet! On 'sackcloth,' see the *E. Bib.* article.

[3] *Early Hebrew Story* (1904), pp. 131 *f.*

ridiculously hairy,[1] nor as having a skin reddened by long exposure to the sun. If Esau is called *'admōnī*, so also is David (1 S. xvi. 12, xvii. 42), in whose case the 'ruddiness' spoken of is a sign of youthful beauty; a skin burned by exposure to the sun would have been otherwise described (see Lam. iv. 8, and contrast Cant. v. 10).

We cannot therefore avoid the conclusion that the account in xxv. 25 represents Esau as a handsome child, with a ruddy hue like the young David. At the same time it must be admitted that with the tradition of the filched birthright in chap. xxvii. there is very distinctly interwoven a reference to a birth-story in which Esau, or rather Seir (= Esau), was represented as hairy (שָׂעִיר), and probably the details which contain the reference are meant to be humorous.[2] Unfortunately the birth-story in question is lost.

The narrator does not leave his story unfinished. We naturally ask how 'the boys' (*v.* 27) grew up. According to the MT., 'Esau became a man skilled in hunting, a man of the open land (שָׂדֶה), and Jacob was a perfect man, a dweller in tents.' Here, as in *v.* 25 *a*, we have two double clauses, and Gunkel, as before, assigns them to different writers. Ought he not, however, first of all to have examined the text, having due regard to usage and to recurrent types of correction? Surely the phrase איש שדה ought to be questioned, (1) because it is too vague, (2) because it occurs nowhere else, and (3) because the phrase which would give the nearest analogy (איש האדמה) occurs only in one passage of MT., and there appears to be corrupt. Observe, too, that the parallel phrase in this description is not (as most suppose) ישב אהלים, but איש תם, and we have a right to expect some further light on the names of the twin brothers. תם, which critics have found so perplexing,[3]

[1] It is not wise to drag in an Arabic word to explain a very doubtful Hebrew word.

[2] Cp., however, the archæological explanation of W. R. Smith and Sayce (*E. Bib.*, col. 1334, note 1).

[3] Some explain תם 'simple, plain' (𝔊 ἄπλαστος; Aq. ἁπλοῦς; Vg. *simplex*); others, 'quiet,' or (*E. Bib.*, col. 1334, note 4) 'harmless.' But תם everywhere else means 'blameless,' or 'devoted to God.' This does not suit here; textual criticism must therefore be applied.

must come from תמול = ישמעאל,[1] for 'Ishmael' is the equivalent of 'Yeraḥme'el,' and it is the name 'Yeraḥ-me'el' which underlies the much-worn and corrupted name 'Yaʿakob.' 'Esau,' then, must obviously be described as אִישׁ אַשְׁחֻר. He was the progenitor of a race which dwelt in a mountainous part of Ashḥur known as Seir. Yaʿakob, on the other hand, represented the dwellers in a neighbouring but more fertile region known to the Israelites as Yishmaʿ'el or Yeraḥme'el. Thus the names of the brothers are clearly accounted for. Now, too, we can see the genesis of the superfluous וישת (*v.* 34), and are relieved from the necessity of endorsing Wellhausen's satirical comment on Hebrew supplementers and redactors.[2] It is probably a corruption of 'הוא אשת, 'that is, Ashtar'—a gloss on עשו, which intruded into the text at a very unsuitable place.[3] We can also now see the popular justification of the equation, Esau = Edom (*v.* 30, cp. xxxvi. 1). The obscure name Edom was popularly interpreted 'red,' and 'Esau' (Asshur) by a little ingenuity acquired the same meaning.

As to their occupations, 'Esau was a skilled hunter, Jacob a dweller in tents.' No more is wanted, and no more is given. The rest of the passage, as we have seen, is geographical.

[1] Cp. אתבעל (1 K. xvi. 31), and note that in 1 K. xxii. 34 תמול has become לְתַמּוֹ. See also on 1 S. x. 10.

[2] 'When the original stops at the statement "he ate," some compassionate soul among the editors is sure to give the man something to drink' (Wellh. *Sam.* p. 25), quoted approvingly by Gunkel.

[3] So in 1 S. i. 9 ואחרי שתה comes from הוא אשתר אשתר, 'that is, Ashḥur [Ashtar],' a gloss on 'Shiloh'; 'Ashtar' is a variant to 'Ashḥur.' In 1 K. iv. 20 שתים ('שתי from שתי) has a similar origin.

ISAAC AT GERAR AND BEERSHEBA
(GEN. XXVI. 1-33)

SOME details (from J and others) respecting Isaac's life at Gerar and Beersheba. Note that Isaac, like Abraham, finds his own moral and religious standards recognised by his hosts and neighbours. All that has to be said here relates to names; it may be supplemented by what has been noticed in chap. xx. (on geographical points and on 'Pelištim'). Cp. also on xii. 10-20, xxi. 22-31. In the present narrative criticism reveals to us many half-effaced indications of a N. Arabian background. Thus in *v.* 2 (end) we should certainly read בארץ אשר ירחמאל (see on xxii. 2), and in *v.* 3 גור בארץ זאת has probably arisen out of בארץ גרר, 'in the land of Gerar,' a gloss on the preceding words 'in the land of Asshur-Yeraḥme'el.'—In *v.* 20 עשק, like אכיש elsewhere, is one of the many early distortions of אשחור; cp. עושק from אשחר [עם], Ps. lxxii. 4, and see on יסכה, xi. 29; יצחק, xvii. 19.—In *v.* 26 'Pikol his general' comes from 'Abimelech, prince of Ṣibeon' (see on xxi. 22). We may therefore well question the correctness of אחזת ('Aḥuzzath'). Its true origin is plain; it has come from אשחת, *i.e.* אשחרת. See on חזו, xxii. 22. מרעהו also needs re-examination. The specialising renderings 'his confidential friend' (*BDB*), 'his vizier' (Holz.), cannot be well supported.[1] Probably מ׳ has come from הוא אֲרָם, 'that is, Aram (Yeraḥme'el),' a gloss on אשחר. Thus *v.* 26 becomes, 'and Abimelech went to him from Gerar [Ashḥur, *i.e.* Aram; *i.e.* Abimelech, a prince of Ishmael].' To connect 'Aḥuzzath' with the Babylonian kakodæmon Aḥḥazu (Stucken) is rather fantastic.

[1] 𝔊 ὁ *νυμφαγωγὸς αὐτοῦ* (cp. Judg. xiv. 20 𝔊 [A and Luc.]).

ESAU'S WIVES (GEN. XXVI. 34, 35)

SINGULARLY enough, the first wife is called יהודית, originally perhaps חורית, Ḥōrith, *i.e.* Ashḥōrith (cp. on xxxvi. 20; also on iii. 20). Her father is בארי, or more probably עֲרָבִי (cp. on Judg. ix. 21). 'Ḥittite' should, as usual, be 'Ashḥartite'; the danger of Esau's marrying a true Ḥittite wife was small enough. Cp. on 'Ephron,' xxiii. 8. The second is בשמת. As in 'Bashan' and other names (see on Ex. xxxi. 2) the initial ב is a fragment of אב, *i.e.* ערב (cp. on xvii. 5); שם, as often, represents ישמן, *i.e.* ישמעאל. No wonder that in xxxvi. 2 'Basemath' should be described as 'daughter of Ishmael.' Cp. on בשם י׳, iv. 26, and on בשמים (בשמי), 1 K. x. 25.

JACOB WINS THE BIRTHRIGHT (GEN. XXVII.)

WE have here an account (from JE) of the crafty device of Jacob (the Hebrew Odysseus) for appropriating the blessing of the first-born, which by rights was Esau's. Morality and religion, as Gunkel well remarks, were not as yet inseparable; morality, in fact, is a plant of slower growth in ancient than in more recent times. Jacob and

Esau may also fitly be regarded as impersonations of the national character of their respective posterities. The story, with its implied approbation of successful shiftiness,[1] flattered the national pride of the Israelites, and yet it is difficult not to observe something like a charitable feeling on the part of the narrators (JE) towards the unfortunate Esau. The narrative as revised by them may be inconsistent, but ancient hearers and readers were not as exacting as modern. Nor is this charity towards Esau the only indication that the story has passed through phases. In *v.* 11 Esau is described as אִישׁ שָׂעִר. Must not the story originally have given the name of Jacob's brother as שֵׂעִיר? See above, p. 241, and cp. Gunkel, who suggests that in *v.* 9, etc. the early narrator gave, not נדי, but שְׂעִיר עִזִּים.

Let us now look at the stratagem of the crafty Ribḳah and her apt pupil Jacob. 'She took the choicest raiment of Esau, and put it upon Jacob, her younger son; she put the skins of the kids of the goats upon his hands, and upon the smooth of his neck' (*vv.* 15 *f.*). Isaac then felt the hands of Jacob and was deceived, and blessed his younger son Jacob (*vv.* 21-23). To mitigate the strangeness of this procedure Robertson Smith suggests that, when seeking the paternal benediction, Jacob is invested with the skins of sacrificial animals, as if Isaac were a semi-divine being.[2] The explanation is certainly in accordance with facts of archæology. It is more natural, however, to look for illustrations in comparative folklore and mythology. Such illustrations abound, and seem to prove that primitive races everywhere delight in narratives of great results obtained by the craft of favourite heroes, like Jacob. Very near the story of Jacob and Isaac is that of Odysseus and Polyphemus in the Odyssey. Odysseus, after blinding the Cyclops, binds his companions and himself under the rams of the monster. Polyphemus, when he lets out the rams, feels every one of them on the back, unaware that under each of the rams one of his crafty enemies is bound.[3] Similarly the Lombards

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Esau,' § 2.

[2] *Rel. Sem.*[(2)], pp. 437, 467; cp. *E. Bib.*, col. 1334, note 1; Barlow, *The Jonah-legend*, pp. 111-118.

[3] W. Grimm collected a number of European and Asiatic stories

told how Godan (Wodan) was induced to bless their ancestors by the artifice of their women, who held their loosened hair before their face, and so deceived the god, who gave them the name of Longibarbi (Longibardi) and promised them the victory. Other specimens of mythological fraud are given by Stucken, *Astralmythen*, pp. 343 *ff*.

The tale is full of picturesque and circumstantial details which need not here be expounded. I may, however, venture to suggest a small correction of the lexicons. In *v.* 3 MT. we meet with the unique word תלי, supposed to mean 'quiver,' to which a pronominal suffix is appended. But is it probable that 'Take now thy weapons (or, thy implements), thy quiver and thy bow,' is correct? Certainly not. In a narrative the only natural expression is 'thy bow and thy arrows,' and, even if this be doubtful, אשפה is the only attested word for 'quiver.' Surely תליך must be corrupt; like תלך in xxiv. 55, it most probably represents תובל, *i.e.* אתבעל (Ethbaal = Ishmael). כליך, too, is hardly right. Why should Isaac waste words? The suffix in כליך is a dittograph of what may seem like a suffix in תליך. Read כלי and combine it with תובל; also omit the ו before ק׳. Thus we get, 'Take [the weapon of Tubal] thy bow'; the bracketed words are a gloss. Tubal = Ishmael; the 'bow of Yeraḥme'el' (= Ishmael) was the most destructive; see Jer. xlix. 35, 'the bow of Elam,' (*i.e.* Yeraḥme'el), and on Hos. i. 7.

closely resembling the story of Polyphemus (see *Die Sage von Polyphem*, 1857). A similar story exists in the Avesta (*Ard Yasht*, x. 56). See Stucken, p. 345.

JACOB'S JOURNEY (GEN. XXVIII. 1-9, 10-22)

THE narrative in xxviii. 1-9 (P) should follow on xxvi. 34, 35. Isaac blesses Jacob (see on xvii. 1, 3), and sends him to Paddan-aram. Esau marries another wife, named מחלת, which, of course, like מחול, מחולה, מחלון, מחלי, represents a fragment of ירחמאל. Cp. on מנחת, xxxvi. 23. Ewald (*Gesch.* i. 553) would read בשמת, because of xxxvi. 3. But see *ad loc.* As Gunkel points out, it was by Esau's marriages that, according to P, he missed the blessing of Isaac.

Vv. 10-22 (cp. on xxxv. 9-15). Following his mother's advice, Jacob—the crafty winner of the blessing—leaves Beersheba (see introduction to chap. xx.), and bends his steps towards Haran (see on xi. 28). On the way he sleeps at Bethel, and has a striking vision. Into Prof. Flinders Petrie's interesting conjecture[1] I need not enter. Dreams at a sanctuary had, of course, a special value and significance. It is rather (1) the contents of the vision and (2) the religious phraseology that I hope to re-interpret here more correctly.

I must, however, first recall to the reader's recollection that the Bethel-story is composite, and that some have supposed that J knew nothing either of the 'ladder' or of the 'angels of Elohim,' but only of an appearance of Yahweh. This imposes upon me the duty of investigating the two phrases rendered respectively 'a ladder' and 'angels of God.' And first as to סֻלָּם. If this word is rightly read and rendered, it is difficult not to suspect a kinship between Jacob's ladder and the most glorious of the many mythological 'ladders,' the 'path of the gods,' *i.e.* the rainbow

[1] *Sinai* (1906), p. 69.

(p. 138). Or, if we preferred it, we might suppose in Assyriological fashion that in the original narrative a gigantic step-tower was meant (see on xi. 1-9), or at any rate that the 'ladder' consisted of seven gigantic steps, corresponding to the seven *tubuḳati* of heaven.[1] It is difficult, however, to make this supposition very plausible; as in the case of the 'tower of Babel,' it is best to begin our researches with careful criticism of the text. First, then, as to סֻלָּם. It is true that סולם in the Mishna, סולמא in Chald., and *sullam* in Ar. mean 'ladder'; also that in Phœn.[2] סלמת is doubtfully conjectured to mean 'ladder' or 'steps.' If, however, סלם in our narrative meant 'ladder,' we may be sure that it would have a gloss, such as מעלה, attached to it. Further, if we accept סלם, and explain it thus, why is עליו in *v.* 13 to be rendered 'beside him' or 'before him'? 'Upon it' would be so much more natural, however inconvenient for the analysis of the sources. It is true, critical analysis has seemed to show that E's account contained no mention of an appearance of Yahweh, and no revelation beyond that of the peculiar sanctity of the spot. but can this be called probable? 'Angels of Elohim' are but a poor substitute for God Himself. And what, pray, is the *raison d'être* of the ascending and descending angels? Surely Jacob needs some direct message of help and guidance from his God.

It may assist us here to consider the second phrase, 'angels of Elohim' (מלאכי אלהים). Can these words be correct? Scarcely. It has, I know, been held that the plurality of angelic beings has grown out of the one מלאך אלהים. But in a legend like this we do not expect to find either many angels or a single angel. Besides, such a phrase as מלאכי אלהים is hardly probable. Except in xxxii. 2 the מלאכים are not again referred to in pre-exilic literature. And the phrase in question is all the more suspicious because, as we have seen (on xvi. 7, xxi. 17), both מלאך יהוה and מל' אלהים have come, through the

[1] See Jeremias, *ATAO*, p. 233, cp. 11 *f.*; Peters, *Anc. Heb. Story*, p. 112, and cp. Cumont, *Mystères de Mithras*, p. 144.

[2] Lidzbarski, *Hdbuch. der nordsem. Epigr.* p. 329; Cooke, *North-Semitic Inscriptions*, p. 73.

manipulation of a redactor, from ירחמאל יהוה, a compound divine name in which Yeraḥme'el takes the first place, because intervention in human affairs specially belongs to the second member of the divine duad or triad of the Israelites. May we not now proceed further, and maintain that מלאכי אלהים has the same origin as מלאך אל׳, *i.e.* that the original text had ירחמאל י׳, and that what we now find is due to the redactor? In this case עלים וירדים בו most probably comes from יעלם ירחבו׳ (בו or בול from מאל as in רכבו, Ex. xv. 1). This will be a gloss on the miswritten word מלאכי.

By this time our eyes ought to be open to the most probable origin of סלם. Where should Yahweh be, but standing beside the sacred pillar of Bethel? This pillar in a correct form of the text would be called סמל, which, like חמן, designates a standing stone or pillar sacred to the special deity of N. Arabia, sometimes called 'Yeraḥme'el,' whence *ḥammān* (see on xxxii. 3) and sometimes 'Ishmael,' whence *semel* (see on Dt. iv. 16, and *Crit. Bib.* on Ezek. viii. 3, 5). The statement in *v.* 12 that the top of the 'Ishmael-pillar' (סמל) reached to heaven suggests that in the original story it may have been a symbol of the mountain of the gods (cp. on xi. 4). Compare the two enormous pillars of brass, called respectively Ishmael (Boaz) and Yeraḥme'el (Yachin), set up in front of Solomon's temple.[1] In the historical period a great Ishmael-pillar probably did stand at Bethel. Jacob, however, only saw it in a dream-vision.

The words which originally closed the sentence in *v.* 12 are not preserved. But the sense may be correctly given by connecting *v.* 12 and *v.* 13 thus, 'And he dreamed, and behold, a pillar set up on earth, whose top reached to heaven. And behold, Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh stood by it, and said, I am Yahweh,' etc. It may be well to add that since the 'name' of Yahweh is 'in' the divine being Yeraḥme'el (see on Ex. xxiii. 21), it is right to make Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh say, 'I am Yahweh.'

But why does the divine speaker continue, 'the God of Abraham thy father'? Was not Isaac Jacob's father? Nor is 'the God of Isaac' the most natural divine title.

[1] See p. 30, note 2, and *E. Bib.*, 'Jachin and Boaz.'

We shall meet with the phrase אלהי אביך again in Ex. iii. 6, אל אביך in xlix. 25, and the parallel אלהי אבי in xxxi. 5 (29 𝔊), 42, xxxii. 10, Ex. xv. 2, xviii. 4. Most probably both אבי and אביך in these phrases come from עֶרֶב[1] as does אבי sometimes in the narrative books (see *e.g.* on iv. 20, xi. 29) and often in personal names (see on xvii. 5). Naturally the God whose primary connexion is with the N. Arabian border-land calls himself the God of Arabia. As for the preceding word אברהם, it should probably be ערב ירחם (cp. on xvii. 5), a variant to the עֶרֶב underlying אביך, and יצחק is either a textual or a popular corruption of אשחֻר (see on xvii. 19). The God of Arabia or Ashḥur could make an assignment of the land at his good pleasure.

It is possible, however, that the original story did not contain the promise of the land. For both in *v.* 16 (J) and in *v.* 17 (E) it is the awe-inspiring theophany, and not a comforting promise of earthly greatness, which fills the mind of the pilgrim. On awaking he says, 'Yahweh is in this place.' 'This is nothing less than the house of Elohim, this is the gate of heaven.' It is the 'stone' to which Jacob here refers, anticipating the *massēbah*[2] which doubtless stood later at the entrance of the sanctuary to Bethel.

May we venture to assume a connexion between the בית אלהים of *v.* 22 (which, in Sievers' hands, becomes בית אל) and the Greek *βαίτυλος* and *βαιτύλιον*? Certainly not on the ground of the apparent resemblance of *βαιτύλος* to בית אל, for the correct Greek representation of בית אל is *βαιθηλ*.[3] It is true, however, that the *baityls* are represented in Philo of Byblus as *λίθοι ἔμψυχοι*, 'animated stones,'[4] and the fact of the theophany, not less real to Jacob than if he had seen and not dreamed it, proves that the 'stone' was already thought to be pervaded by the material essence of divinity—an essence which Jacob sought to heighten by

[1] אביך represents ערב in xii. 1 (cp. xxxi. 29), xlix. 4, 8, though not in xlix. 25 (see note).

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Massebah' (G. F. Moore), and references in *BDB*, 1125 *b*.

[3] Lagrange, *Rel. sém.*(1) p. 194.

[4] The *baityls* were supposed to have come from heaven (*i.e.* sometimes at least they were aerolites); this could not be said of Jacob's stone. Cp. *E. Bib.*, col. 2978 (Moore).

sacrificially pouring oil upon it (*v.* 18), *i.e.* some mysteriously sacred oil which was as effectual for its purpose as the 'oil of life' which flows in the heavenly Paradise (see p. 41). We cannot for our present purpose make use of the Babylonian divine name of west Semitic origin, Bait-ili, for this (see below) has undergone transformation, much less of the corrupt phrase אבן ישראל in xlix. 24. Nor can I see more than an analogy in the anointing of the foundation-stones of Assyrian temples[1] (*KB* i. 45, ii. 113, 151, 261).

Lastly, as to *v.* 19. The second part is admittedly a gloss, which records the fact that the place now called Bethel formerly bore the name of Luz. These two place-names—the true origin of which was doubtless forgotten when the narrators lived—are really equivalent. Using right methods we find that ביתאל, equally with the divine name (*KAT*, p. 347; see above) Bait-ili, is a very early transformation of אתבאל = ישמעאל,[2] while לוז has come by transposition of letters from זול = זבל, *i.e.* 'ישמ; see on זבלון, xxx. 20, and on Judg. i. 26 (ליש = לוז). Probably אולם, which precedes, is an old variant to לוז, and comes from ירחמאל or from ישמעאל (cp. on xxi. 33). At any rate, there is no reason for such a strong antithetic particle as אוּלָם; the parallel gloss in Judg. i. 23 is quite complete without it. 𝔊 has already led the way with its Ουλαμμαυς (μαυς comes from לוז). The same error has arisen in Judg. xviii. 29, where MT. has ואולם ליש, but 𝔊 καὶ Ουλαμαις. Here אולם may be a variant to ליש. Winckler independently takes offence at the supposed antithetic particle. According to him, *'ulâm* is = *'olâm*, the north point, where the Supreme God dwells, and here a place-name (p. 429).

[1] Cp. Lagrange, *op. cit.* p. 196; Driver, *Genesis*, p. 268.

[2] Bait-ili is, in fact, a form of the god Ishmael (cp. *KAT*[3], pp. 437 *f.*).

JACOB DWELLS WITH LABAN; MARRIAGES (GEN. XXIX. 1-30)

JACOB goes on his way from Bethel, and arrives in the 'land of the benê Reḳem' (= Yarḥam, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el). The traditional text has קדם, which Ed. Meyer consistently, but wrongly,[1] defends. There is no essential difference between this statement (*v.* 1) and that in *v.* 4 (cp. xxvii. 43, xxviii. 10), where Laban's home is placed in Ḥaran, for Ḥaran is certainly a Yeraḥme'elite country (cp. 1 Chr. ii. 46); indeed, P's name for the region is Paddan-aram (see on xxv. 20). The phrase referred to must have come from an early form of the tradition.[2]

The narrative begins pleasingly (cp. Ex. ii. 16-19), but soon changes its colour. In the battle of wits which ensues Jacob is not at first a match for Laban. He has bargained for Rachel as the reward of his toil, but he gets Leah. The names cannot be passed over; what is their meaning? Are Leah (wild cow?) and Rachel (ewe?) 'primitive numina in animal form'? Ed. Meyer even now (1906) thinks so (p. 426). To me, however, it seems equally uncritical to treat names singly and to group them otherwise than by the principle of external resemblance; *e.g.* רחל ought not to be separated from אחרחל (1 Chr. iv. 8), אחר[3] (1 Chr. vii. 12), אחרח (1 Chr. viii. 1), חרחיה (Neh. iii. 8). Grüneisen deserves credit for grouping רחל with אחרחל, but surely he loses it again by explaining the latter name as 'brother of an ewe.'[4] Textual criticism, however, shows that אח comes from אחר,

[1] See on x. 30, xxv. 6, 15; also *E. Bib.*, 'Rekem,' 'Sela.'
[2] Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Jacob,' § 3.
[3] Num. xxvi. 38, אשחר ארם = אחירם.
[4] Grüneisen, *Ahnenkultus* (1900), p. 257.

i.e. אשחֵר (see on xxii. 13) and רחל from ירחמאל.[1] And the name לאה, like לוי (see on *v.* 34) has surely a similar origin, *i.e.* it comes from יאלה, and is to be grouped with יעל (Judg. iv. 17) and יעלה (Ezra ii. 56); cp. also on 'Iolaus' (p. 31, note 1); אהל, iv. 20; אהלים, Judg. viii. 11. All these words come from fragments of 'Yeraḥme'el.' Lovers of serpent-myths, however, may prefer to regard 'Leah' as the name of a *numen* in the form of a serpent. And so we get back to mother Eve the serpent! This is Ed. Meyer's view; he also supposes that Leah was originally only the mother of Simeon and Levi.

As to the names of the maids, the usual explanations are only poor guesses.[2] זלפה must be grouped with צלף (Neh. iii. 30) and שלף (x. 26), which come from צבל and שבל respectively, *i.e.* represent ישמעאל. Cp. also זבל (in איזבל) = 'ישמ, and on צלפחד, Num. xxvi. 33. The fellow-name בלהה must be grouped with the בעלה of Josh. xix. 3, for which 1 Chr. iv. 29 gives בלהה. Cp also בלהן, xxxvi. 27, 1 Chr. vii. 10, and probably בהן, Josh. xv. 6. The occurrences are significant, and the common origin of the forms is 'ירחמ or 'ישמ (cp. on xi. 9). Cp. *E. Bib.*, col. 5418, note 2; Ed. Meyer, *Die Israel.* pp. 344, 531, who misses the highly probable connexion between בהן and בלהן.

[1] 𝔊's ἀδελφοῦ ρηχαβ presupposes אחרכב, *i.e.* Ashḥur-rekab.

[2] Stucken (*Beiträge*, 1902, p. 62) connects זלפה with זִלְעָפָה and בִלהה with בִּלְהָה, and explains by mythology. Cp. also *E. Bib.* 'Zilpah.

BIRTHS OF JACOB'S CHILDREN
(GEN. XXIX. 31-XXX. 24)

WHAT lies before us here is no genuine tradition, but an artificial link between two series of popular stories. It was necessary to record the births of the sons and of the daughter of Jacob, of whom so much was to be said later (Gunkel). The names are accompanied by popular explanations. It is customary to look down upon the simple-minded people who derived ראובן from ראה בעניי (*v.* 32), not knowing that Reuben is really cognate with the Arabic *rî'bâl*, 'lion' or 'wolf,'[1] though some of our wise teachers prefer to speculate on possible meanings of a word *rĕ'ī.* A keener criticism, however, needs to be applied to the names. If we group ראובן with the forms which resemble it, אל ראי (xvi. 13), רעואל (xxxvi. 4), אריאל (2 S. xxiii. 20), ראיה (1 Chr. iv. 2), ירבעל (Judg. vi. 32), and in Aramaic inscriptions רבאל, רמאל (Cook, *Gloss.* pp. 107 *f.*), and study these names in the light of our previous experience, we shall be able to give a final solution of the problem of 'Reuben' (cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Reuel'); for it has, I think, been abundantly shown that בעל in proper names has frequently come from the second half of ישמעאל or ירחמאל, and that ראו (like ארי and ראי) may also represent a fragment of ירחמאל, and no one, I suppose, doubts that the final ן has taken the place of an original ל. ראובן, therefore, is a corruption (the origin of which was early forgotten) of ירחמאל.

This will appear still more necessary when we have criticised *v.* 32 *b.* It appears at first sight as if the closing words, 'for now my husband will love me,' should be a

[1] For this and other explanations see Hogg's accurate conspectus in *E. Bib.*, 'Reuben,' § 9; and cp. Nöldeke's opinion, *ibid.* 'Names,' § 62.

second explanation (due to E ?) of the name Reuben. But how is it possible that יאהבני can have been supposed either to explain or even to illustrate ראובן ? Gunkel has remarked that the true word (now supplanted by יאהבני) must have contained the ר of ראובן, and has suggested as the original verb אורב, 'to praise,' or רבי (Dan. ii. 48), 'to magnify.' The objection is that we require a synonym for יאהבני, and such a synonym Gunkel has not produced. The only true synonym for the verb now in possession is ירחמני (רחם, 'to have a warm affection for,' common in Aramaic, and actually used here by Pesh.). This reading I would restore. It is true, this implies that the form of the name here explained was not ראובן but רחומן (or the like). But may we not assume that different forms of the name were current in early times? In fact, in *v.* 32 *a*, by the explanation ראה בעניי, J implies not ראובן but רובען. Just so in xxx. 20 we shall find it probable that the explanations of 'Zebulun' suggest other forms of the tribal name, viz. Zabdōn and Shalmōn.

Next, as to Shimeon (שמעון = שִׁמְעָן), *v.* 33. Have we here a hyæna-tribe?[1] Surely not. The name cannot be separated from שמע, 'Shema,' the name of a Calebite clan (1 Chr. ii. 43 *f.*), connected genealogically with Reḳem, Raḥam, and Yorḳeam, all of which are forms of Yarḥam or Yeraḥme'el. Cp. also the tribal name מעונים. שמען is doubtless a form of ישמעאל,[2] for the origin of which see on xvi. 11. According to Spiegelberg, a Hyksos king had a name like 'Simeon.'

'Levi' (לֵוִי) is traced in *v.* 34 to לָוָה, 'to be joined' (cp. Num. xviii. 2, 4, P), a connexion which some moderns also favour, while others prefer to regard 'Levi' as the gentilic of 'Leah.'[3] Sound method, however, requires us to group לוי with אולי, which, in an earlier form of the text of Zech. xi. 15 and Dan. viii. 2, was probably אומלי or אובלי, *i.e.* ירחמאלי. In Dan. *l.c.* we actually find אולי and אובל side by side, as alternative readings (cp. the Greek readings,

[1] See Hogg, *E. Bib.*, 'Simeon,' § 8.

[2] So Land, *De Gids*, Oct. 1871, p. 21, 'Simeon, a body of Ishmaelites which attached itself to Israel.'

[3] Wellh. *Prol.*(3) p. 146; Stade, *ZATW*, 1881, p. 116.

E. Bib., 'Ulai'). The Yeraḥme'elites were specially known as priests and diviners; one of the words for priests (כמרים) most probably comes from רקמים, *i.e.* men of Reḳem (Yeraḥme'el).[1] Hommel's comparison of the S. Arabian *lavi'u*, 'priest' (*AHT*, p. 278), and Ed. Meyer's connexion (p. 426) of לוי (and לאה) with 'Liwyathan,' now become unnecessary.

We now come to the important name Yehūdāh, *v.* 35. Popular etymology makes this the 'praised (renowned)'; cp. xlix. 8. Land (*l.c.*) defends this; he regards Yehūdāh, Reuben ('reconciled, reunited'), and Simeon ('Ishmaelitish') as late. This, however, will not hold. In Josh. xix. 45 יהוד is a Danite place; in Gen. xlvi. 10, Ex. vi. 15, אהד (Ohad) is a son of Simeon; and in Judg. iii. 15 *ff.*, 1 Chr. vii. 10, אהוד (Ehud) is a Benjamite. This suggests that אהד or יהד was a deeply rooted Israelite name, and presumably old. I have not yet mentioned אביהוד, *i.e.* אבי הוד[י] = Arab-Yehûd, indicating that Yehûd was originally a N. Arabian name. Probably we may connect it with הדד and חדד. The former appears as an Arammite name (xxxvi. 35), the latter as Ishmaelite (xxv. 15). Aram and Ishmael are practically synonymous.

We now come to the children of the handmaids. The first is דָּן, Dan (xxx. 6). Plausible as it may be to take 'Dan' as a shortened theophorous name (= 'El is judge'), experience is against this view. Shortened, however, the name seems to be; *i.e.* it comes from Adon or Addon, Adan or Addan (cp. Ezra ii. 59, Neh. vii. 61), which was probably the name both of a tribe and of a region. This throws a light on a group of Hebrew and Phœnician proper names (see on 2 S. iii. 4, Ezek. xiv. 14). Whether 'Dan' and 'Dinah' are connected is doubtful. See on *v.* 21.

The next, נפתלי, Naphtali (*vv.* 7, 8). The explanation in the text is strange. 'Wrestlings of Elohim have I wrestled with my sister; I have also prevailed.' Here there are three difficulties. 1. The form נפתולֵי. 2. The meaning of the phrase 'wrestlings of Elohim.' 3. The reference of the statement that Rachel had wrestled with and prevailed over her sister, which seems opposed to the fact that Leah had already had four children, Rachel only two.

[1] Cp. Isa. ii. 6, where מקדם probably comes from רקמים or כמרים.

For the first there is no remedy, there being no Semitic parallel for the form. For the second there is no *adequate* explanation. Does the phrase 'wrestlings of Elohim' mean (*a*) struggles in the divine cause, or (*b*) struggles brought to a happy end by God, or (*c*) violent struggles,[1] or (*d*) struggles for the divine blessing?[2] Clearly the fourth interpretation is the best (xxix. 31, xxx. 2). As to the third difficulty, Gunkel suggests that if Rachel 'prevailed' over her sister, it could only be because, according to E, Reuben thus far was Leah's only son. This, however, involves supposing that E gave the births in a different order from J, which is a purely arbitrary conjecture, and disregards the important fact that נפ׳ אלהים is inconsistent with עם־אחתי; instead of אחתי the sense absolutely requires the name of a deity.

Can we throw any fresh light on this problem? I think that Prof. H. W. Hogg is well advised when he suggests[2] illustrating נפ׳ אל׳ by the story of Jacob's contest in xxxii. 23-33. In connexion with this, it is not difficult from our point of view to discover the true explanation of the passage.[3] Here, as often, אלהים is most probably either a corruption or a deliberate modification of ירחמאל—the name by which the god of the N. Arabian Yeraḥme'elites was known to the Israelites (see on ii. 4 *b*). A still worse corruption of another name of the N. Arabian deity, viz. אשחור, is אחתי, in which ת is a corruption or alteration of ר (cp. 𝔊, xxxvi. 40, Ιεθερ = MT.'s יתת). We may illustrate this by two other passages with אחת (probably) for אשחר, viz. Judg. ix. 5, 18, על־אבן אחת, where על is a redactional insertion, and אבן אחת comes from בְּנֵי אַשְׁחֵר, a gloss on בני ירבעל (= בני ירחמאל), and Isa. lxvi. 17, where אחת (Kr.), equally with אחר (Kt.), has most probably come from אַשְׁחֵר. Again, a third corruption is נפתולי from נִפְתַּלְתִּי, after which word עם has fallen out. Thus we get a duplicate reading, נפתלתי עם ירחמאל, and נפ׳ עם אשחור. Rachel says that she has wrestled with her god (*i.e.* by the use of recognised forms of adjuration and the like), whose names are Yeraḥme'el and

[1] Driver compares נשיא אלהים, xxiii. 6, but see on that passage.

[2] *E. Bib.*, 'Naphtali,' § 2.

[3] Stucken, as usual, mythologises (*Beiträge*, 1902, i. 62). But he assumes the faulty reading עם־אחתי.

Ashḥur, and has 'prevailed.' Literally, Jacob had done so (xxxii. 23 *ff.*); metaphorically, Rachel is not behind him.

But what is the true origin of 'Naphtali'? A plausible suggestion was made by Land (*De Gids*, Oct. 1871, p. 20), who derived נפתל, 'highland,' from נפת, 'height,' comparing כרמל from כרם. Most probably, however, נפת, in the phrase נפת דור (Josh. xi. 2), comes from נפתוח, a tribal name as well as a place-name—the נִפְתָּחִים of x. 13 (see note). Another form of the name of this tribe was perhaps נפתאלים or נפתלים, where אל is the common formative ending, as in ירחמאל.

Gad and Asher. Leah's adoptive children come next (*vv.* 10-13). On the birth of each Leah utters a similar exclamation, the one בְּגָד (Kt.), the other באשרי. בְּגָד may, perhaps, have meant to the narrator 'by good fortune'[1] (𝔊, *ἐν τύχῃ*; cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Gad,' § 1), but originally it no doubt signified 'by Gad's help.' The name belonged both to a god and to a tribe; most probably the benê Gad were originally worshippers of Gad.[2] Another name for this deity was perhaps גדון (miswritten דגון, Judg. xvi. 23, etc.), and a fuller form of the name was בעל גד, *i.e.* probably ירחמאל גד. The other divine name, מני, in the traditional text of Isa. lxv. 11 should probably be read ימן[3] (Yaman = Yeraḥme'el; cp. on x. 2).

If בגד means 'by Gad's help,' we may well hesitate to read באשרי, 'by my good fortune.' Surely אשרי covers over, and that very lightly, a divine name. Can we doubt what that name is? If Rachel wrestled with Ashḥur, must not her sister have done the same? Read, therefore, בַּאֲשׁוּר. The inference is justified that there was a second form of the tribal name 'Asher,' viz. 'Asshur.' The existence of a weakened form of the divine name 'Asshur' appears to be implied in the feminine form Asherah (see pp. 24 *f.* and on Ex. xxxiv. 13). Asshur and Yeraḥme'el are virtually identical.

[1] The Midrash (*Ber. rabba*, par. lxxi.), accepting the Ḳr. בא גד, understands by Gad the 'Luck' of the house, the domestic Good Genius (cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Fortune').

[2] We must not support this by גדיאל, Num. xiii. 10, the אל, as usual in such names, being simply formative.

[3] The corruption was caused by ומניתי in *v.* 12; read וּמְנִיתִי.

A strange story (*vv.* 14-16) is now interwoven with the narrative. It relates to the finding of *dūdā'īm*, 'mandrakes' or 'love-apples.' We may compare the *shammu-sha-alâdi*, or 'plant of birth,' in the Etana legend (*KB* vi. 1, 109; cp. Jastrow, *RBA*, p. 520). But why is it, we may well ask, that Reuben is the finder of the 'love-apples'? Stucken[1] sets himself to show that the possessor of the apple famous in mythology was the husband of two wives. From this it seems to him to follow that originally Reuben, and not Jacob, was the husband of Leah and Rachel, and the ancestor of the clan afterwards named after Jacob-Israel. The compiler of the traditions took one, but only one, of the special Reuben-traditions, and worked it into the Jacob-story.

A simpler solution seems preferable. Gunkel points out that Reuben was now five or six years old; his brothers would not yet be clever enough to pick the mandrakes and take them home. This remark, however, does not go to the root of the matter. The real reason probably is that Reuben was the worshipper of the god Dôd, whose connexion with the *dūdā'īm* is not indeed affirmed, but, at least to a modern reader, suggested by Cant. vii. 13 *f.* Dôd was a title or second name of the god Yeraḥme'el; the worship of the feminine deity Dôdah is attested for the Gadites, and may be presumed for the Reubenites, who were much mixed up with the Gadites. See further pp. 46-49 (on Dôd).

Leah's fifth son is called Issachar (יִשָּׂשׂכָר), *vv.* 17 *f.* The popular wit recognised in the name שָׂכָר, 'hire' (cp. on xlix. 14). Either Jacob received the recompense from Leah (*v.* 16), or Leah had it for giving her maid Zilpah to Jacob. If names of tribes or heroes were formed on this model, we might explain אִישׁ שָׂכָר 'man of hire'; but how many will (with Ed. Meyer, p. 536) accept this interpretation?[2] Let us frankly reject the second שׂ as due to the popular ety-

[1] *Beiträge*, i. 58 *f.*; cp. *Astralmythen*, p. 5, note *.

[2] Ginsburg (*Introduction*, p. 252) explains יִשָּׂא שָׂכָר, 'he brings reward' (xxx. 18), or 'he takes hire' (xlix. 14 *f.*). But the narrator seems to have found איש in the name; cp. לאישי xxx. 18 (Wellh. *TSB*, p. 95).

mology, and maintain the original form of the name to be ישכר, or rather אשכר.[1] And what is אשכר? It might be a corruption of אשחר, but the parallel of דמשק and כשדים (see on xi. 31, xiv. 15) suggests as the more probable origin, אשר ירחמ', 'Asshur-Yerahme'el' (see on 'Eshkol,' xiv. 13; שכרך, xv. 1). See further, Ball's note in *Genesis*; Hogg, *E. Bib.*, 'Issachar,' §§ 3, 6 (end).[2]

Leah's sixth and last son is זבלון (*vv.* 19 *f.*). The two appended explanations are puzzling, for they do not give intelligible, even if popular, etymologies of the name. The first is, 'Elohim has presented me (זבדני) with a fair present'; this implies the form זבדון, 'Zabdon' or 'Zebudun.' The second, 'at last my husband will * me, for I have borne him six sons,' in the Hebrew of which יזבל is untranslatable,[3] and must have arisen by a redactor's manipulation out of some other word. What was that word? The problem is not quite the same as that in xxix. 32, for there we had to find some synonym for יאהבני containing the letter ר; here we have to find out a perfectly suitable word, out of which יזבלני may have arisen by the ordinary causes of textual corruption. I make bold to say that there is only one such word; it is ישלמני. This implies the form שלמון; but why should there not have been a name Shalmon, belonging to the same clan or body of clans which was more commonly called Zebulun? As a matter of fact, all the names derived apparently from √זבל are really corruptions of ישמעאל; the names are זבל, Judg. ix. 28, etc., [אי]זבל in 1 K. xvi. 31, and [ון]זבל, and the middle form between ישמעאלון and זבלון is שלמון = שמלון. To return to the form זבדון, presupposed by זבדני. That there was an extensive clan called זבד, we may safely infer from the names, Zabdi, Zabdiel, Zabud, Zebudah, Zebadiah, Yozabad; and in so late a record as 1 Macc. (xii. 31) we read of an Arabian tribe near Damascus called

[1] Cp. the Minæan proper name ישכראל, quoted from D. H. Müller by Hogg (*E. Bib.*, col. 2290, note 4).

[2] The present writer's suggestion in 'Issachar,' *E. Bib.*, was a step in the right direction, for both Ḥeres and Zeraḥ appear to have grown out of Ashḥur.

[3] Some would explain יזבלני by the Ass. *zabâlu*, 'to carry, bring,' but sometimes apparently 'to lift up.' But even 'lift up' does not give quite a natural sense. 𝔊's αἱρετιεῖ με seems to be a guess.

Zabadæans.[1] There may have been a confusion between the two independent tribal names זבדון and זבלון.

It is remarkable that no account should be given of the feminine name דינה, Dinah. Was the reference inserted by an after-thought (to prepare for chap. xxxiv.), and therefore expressed scantily. One may plausibly connect the word with בני עדין[2] (Ezra ii. 15, viii. 6, Neh. vii. 20) and the Reubenite personal name עדינא (1 Chr. xi. 42), also with יהועדן and יהועדין (see on 2 K. xiv. 2), and, lastly, with the ethnic דיניא (see on Ezra iv. 9), and, more remotely, the בני עדן of 2 K. xix. 12 (cp. on Gen. ii. 8, Am. i. 5, Ezek. xxvii. 23). If the connexion with the last two names is correct, the disappearance of Dinah is not 'absolute' (*E. Bib.*, col. 1101). Cp. on 'Dan,' *v.* 6.

One more birth—that of יוסף, Joseph (*vv.* 22-24), which E derives from אסף, 'to take away, and J from יסף, 'to add.' Nöldeke (*E. Bib.*, 'Names,' § 53) explains '[Yahweh] increases,' comparing יוספיה, Ezra viii. 10. Here, however, the full phrase is 'Shelōmīth ben Yosiphiah,' and Shelomith is to be grouped with Shelumiel (Num. i. 6), Shelomi (Num. xxxiv. 27), etc., all of which are closely connected with Ishmael. This fact creates a presumption that the name Yosiphiah (and consequently also Yoseph) had its origin in the Yerahme'elite or Ishmaelite region of N. Arabia; in fact, this origin is at once suggested (from our point of view) by the second element in the name Yosiph-iah, which, as in other cases, represents ירח, *i.e.* Yarḥam or Yerahme'el. Now as to 'Yoseph.' In 1 Chr. xxv. 2 'Yoseph' is one of the sons of Asaph (אסף), a name to be grouped with the Rephaite name Saph (2 S. xxi. 18) or Sippai (1 Chr. xx. 4), and apparently a shortened form of אביסף (Ex. vi. 24), the name of one of the sons of Korah, a brother of whom is called אסיר, probably a corruption of אשור (the N. Arabian Asshur).[3] Most probably יוסף is a

[1] Cp. also the Palmyrene name Zabd-nebu (Cooke, p. 295).

[2] In Ezra ii. 15 (Neh. vii. 20) the benê 'Adin come after the benê Adonikam (= Adon-Yerahme'el); in viii. 6, 7, they are followed by the benê 'Elam (also a Yerahme'elite or Ishmaelite name).

[3] Cp. Cheyne, *Book of Psalms*[(2)], Introd. p. xlii. In Ezra ii. 41 (Neh. viii. 44) 'the singers, the benê Asaph,' are grouped with families whose names are certainly N. Arabian.

popular corruption of יאסף, a fragment of the Korahite (N. Arabian) name אביאסף.[1] It is true, this implies a faulty analysis of the latter name, as if it were from אב־יאסף, whereas really it is from אבי־אסף, *i.e.* עֲרַב אסף, 'Asaphite Arabia' (cp. on xvii. 5, xx. 2). But such wrong popular analyses are as possible in Hebrew as they appear to be in Sanskrit. That many Asaphites joined the Israelite immigrants follows from Num. xi. 4.—It only remains (1) to find instances of names resembling 'Yoseph' outside the O.T., and (2) to throw the faint light of conjecture on this name. As to (1), I am disinclined to refer to the Palestinian place-name Jšp'r in the list of Thotmes III. (No. 78),[2] because this is more probably to be connected with ישמעאל, the linking forms being ישבאל, ישבעאל (cp. ישבאב, ישבעם). But I see no absolute hindrance to comparing the ancient Babylonian personal name Yašup-ilu, and the Phœnician royal names given in Assyrian inscriptions as Milki-ašapa and Baal-iašupu (*E. Bib.*, cols. 2583 *f.*). And as to (2), may not Asaph have arisen out of a mutilated form of some well-known N. Arabian name, such as ספרת, Neh. vii. 57, the original form of which may be צרפת (cp. on x. 14). It would certainly not be more strange that one tribal hero should bear a name connecting him with the Ṣarephathites than that others should be called by names traceable to Yeraḥme'el, Ishmael, and Ashḥur or Asshur. See further, on chap. xxxvii., and cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Joseph.'

[1] Another form of this name is אביסף (1 Chr. vi. 8, etc.).

[2] Ed. Meyer now leaves it perfectly open whether Jšp'r means Joseph-el or not (*Die Israeliten*, p. 292). Cp. *E. Bib.*, col. 2582, note 1. For Winckler's view see *GI* ii. 68.

JACOB'S CRAFT AND SELF-RIGHTEOUSNESS
(GEN. XXX. 25-43, XXXI. 1-16)

A NEW contract is made, but Jacob turns the tables on Laban, outdoes him in craft, and wins all Laban's best cattle.—Three points have to be noticed. In *v.* 30, לרגלי, which Dillmann renders, 'at every step of mine'; Gunkel, 'since I have been here'; but for which the sense requires בגללי (*v.* 27). In *v.* 37, ערמון. The plane tree will do as well or as ill as any other tree, but ערמון probably comes from רעמן, and means 'the Raamite or Yeraḥme'elite (tree),' just as תאשור means 'the Asshurite (tree),' and עץ שמן 'the Ishmaelite (tree).' עֵץ רענן has the same origin (see on Dt. xii. 2). In *v.* 43, 'and camels and asses,' at the end of the list, cannot be right; see on xxiv. 35.

Laban's altered demeanour towards Jacob leads to a conversation (xxxi. 5-16) between that self-righteous hero and his wives, in the course of which he relates two theophanies and revelations; the narrative in *vv.* 10-13 is not at all smooth or connected, but we may ascribe this to the redactor. The wives place themselves entirely on Jacob's side; his interests have become theirs. 'Whatever Elohim has said to thee, do.'—Something has to be remarked on the names of God. In *v.* 5 Jacob tells his wives that their father's displeasure is unreasonable, seeing that 'the God of my father (אלהי אבי) has been with me.' But did Laban really worship a different God from Jacob? How was it that Isaac, in his instructions to Jacob, made no reference to this important point? We shall see, however, that not only here but elsewhere אב or אבי 'father,' has supplanted עֲרָב, 'Arabia.' It was the God of the land, and people of the region of Arab-arām whom Jacob, not less than Laban, worshipped, and whose favour was now

turned towards Jacob,—the God whose full name was Yahweh-Yeraḥme'el. See on *vv.* 29, 42, 53, xxviii. 13, also the following note.

And who was it that spoke to Jacob in his dream-vision? From what has been said on xxi. 17 it should be clear that it was no mere messenger, but the friendly, beneficent deity whose name was Yahweh-Yeraḥme'el or Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh. The narrator's form is מלאך האלהים; but מל׳ (as we know) comes from ירחמאל, and האלהים is a substitute for יהוה. In the preceding note mention has been made of one of the titles of this deity. *V.* 13 gives us another; it is אֵל בֵּיתְאֵל, 'God of Bethel' (see on xxviii. 19). The text, however, has הָאֵל; how is this to be accounted for? Neither by expanding in the manner of 𝔊 and Onk. (Olsh., Ball), nor by grammatical subtleties (see *e.g.* Driver, *Tenses*, § 191, obs. 2; Ges.-Kau., § 127 *f.*). The key is probably supplied by Isa. xlii. 5, Ps. lxxxv. 9, where האל seems to have come from ירחמאל. Here, too, האל may have the same origin. The final אל, too, may have expelled the essential word אל in the phrase אל ביתאל. Thus we shall get, אנכי ירחמ׳ אל ב׳. In truth, the ancient name of the God of Bethel was, we can hardly doubt, ירחמאל; at any rate, this was the name of the N. Arabian divinity known to the Israelites. See on xxviii. 10-22, also on xxxv. 7.

JACOB'S DEPARTURE; GILEAD

(GEN. XXXI. 17-XXXII. 1)

THE turning-point has come. Obeying the oracle, Jacob takes a hurried departure from the place where he has laboured for twenty years. He is accompanied by 'his sons and his wives.' Rachel carries away her father's 'teraphim,' and so ensures for herself and her new house-

hold the protection of the gods of Laban's family. From xxxv. 2 (cp. Josh. xxiv. 2, 14, 20, 23) we gather that the members of Jacob's household also had taken with them religious symbols of the nature of images; they had also earrings which were regarded as heathenish; no doubt, they were used as amulets. Laban pursues Jacob, and overtakes him on the mountain-range of 'Gilead' (see below). But Elohim (*i.e.* Yerahme'el, the common deity of Laban and Jacob) warns Laban not to enter into any controversy with Jacob. Laban therefore enters into a compact with his kinsman on 'Gilead.' They part in peace.

Let us first give our best attention to geography. The subject certainly presents some great difficulties. 'That the two narratives, J and E, meant the same part of the Gilead range can hardly be maintained. They both differ from the original story; they also differ from one another.' So I wrote formerly in the *E. Bib.* ('Gilead,' § 4), from the point of view which assumes J and E to have meant by 'Gilead' a region on the east of the Jordan. This assumption, however, is not as safe as I supposed. J and E, as it now appears, have undergone redactional manipulation. Nor was the geography of the original story, common to J and E, that which is supposed in the *Encyclopædia* ('Galeed'). It was plainly necessary to put the student on a track of advanced inquiry; some step forward had to be taken, otherwise the work would have been antiquated even before it was published. But the first attempt to recover the underlying geographical names was not successful. Nor was it brought out that what the composite story (JE) leads to is a contract between two clans both residing in the Arabian border-land to keep each within its own limits. It is not the present writer's duty to clear up all that is geographically obscure in the Genesis narratives. He is prepared for large alterations and improvements, as they become necessary through the progress of the exploration of Palestine and Arabia. What he claims to have definitely effected is the discovery of a large number of neglected textual phenomena which facilitate the gradual recovery of an earlier underlying form of the text.

It seems, however, to be extremely probable that by 'the stream' (הנהר) in *v.* 21 the original narrative meant one of the wâdys of the Arabian border-land (for which see on xv. 18). Perhaps the stream or wâdy of Ephrath or Perāth may be intended, which in xv. 18 (underlying text) appears to be represented as Gileadite. The southern Ḥaran (see on xi. 31), which was in 'the land of the benê Reḳem' (xxix. 1, E), seems to have been near this stream or wâdy. It is now in point to refer to the statement in the traditional text (xxxi. 22 *f.*) that from Ḥaran to the Gileadite mountains was a journey of seven, or, with flocks and herds, of ten days. From the ordinary point of view, this is plainly impossible. Shall we then suppose that E imagined Laban's home to be much nearer to the trans-Jordanic Gilead than Ḥaran, and that 'he arose and crossed the stream (Euphrates)' in *v.* 21 comes from the other narrator (J)? This is Dillmann's view. Or shall we suppose that the number 'seven' in *v.* 23 is corrupt, *i.e.* that the original text had some other number? This is Strack's view. Or, considering the parallel of 1 K. xix. 8 (see *Crit. Bib. ad loc.*), shall we conclude that here, as elsewhere, the numeral covers over an ethnic or a place-name? Surely, to obtain the best sense, we require, not a numeral, but a place-name. Therefore, instead of דרך שבעת ימים, let us restore as the original reading דרך שבעת ימנים; ימים from ימנים, as xlix. 13; cp. on Dt. xxxiii. 23 (ים), Job iii. 8 (יום), 1 K. xiv. 31 (ערב ימן = אבים, 'Yamanite Arabia'). Thus the direction of Jacob's flight was towards Shibeah of the Yamanites (see on יון, x. 2); Shibeah may be = one of the places called Beer-sheba[1] (see on xxvi. 33, and cp. on chap. xx. and xxi. 14).

In this connexion may one venture to exonerate a scribe from Gunkel's accusation of 'pedantry'? Certainly ובאהל שתי האמהת in *v.* 33 represents a gloss, but the glossator cannot have written אמהת; the context makes it perfectly obvious that the tents examined were those of Leah and of Rachel. אמהת must be a corruption of

[1] From 2 S. xx. 1 we may perhaps venture to infer that there was a place called Sheba near the stream Yarḥon. In chap. xxxii. 11 Jacob's passage of this stream is mentioned.

אֲרַמִּי. The scribe had a perfectly sensible object. Aram or Yerahme'el was the home of superstition; by inserting the gloss the late scribe wished to convey instruction and warning to his contemporaries. Note that in *vv.* 20, 24 Laban is, contrary to custom, described as 'the Aramæan.'

At the same time, minor superstitions cannot alter the fact that Laban and Jacob worshipped the same God. One may, indeed, infer from the words 'the God of your father spoke to me' (*v.* 29) that the contrary was the case, but we should be in error. The Hebrew text is clearly wrong; the phrase 'the God of your father' (אל׳ אביכם), addressed to Jacob, is impossible. Seeing this, Ball would read אביך (so Sam., 𝔊, who also read, rightly, עִמְּךָ). But this is not enough. We have seen already that אב and אבי often represent עֵבֶר. In *vv.* 5 and 42 this word is the original of אבי; here (as in xxviii. 13) it is the word which underlies אביך.

In the same verse (29), as in 2 K. ix. 26[1] and Job xxx. 3,[2] אמש is also corrupt, as the warning Pasek may indicate. It has probably come from ישמע׳ (a short way of writing ישמעאל), on which a scribe gave the marginal gloss ירחמאל, represented by לאמר, as in Ex. xv. 1,[3] 2 S. v. 1.[4] Thus we get 'the God of Arab-Ishmael [Yerahme'el] said to me' (cp. on *v.* 42). The proper force of לאמר was not so constantly forgotten that good writers have to be burdened with the awkward phrase ויאמרו לאמר.

We now see how to correct אלהי אבי (*v.* 42), and the note on xxviii. 13 indicates the text underlying the variant אל׳ אברהם (𝔊 simply Αβρααμ). 'The fear of Isaac' is surprising.[5] Why not the *God* of Isaac,' as in xxviii. 13? And why 'the God of *Isaac*' instead of some title equivalent to 'the God of Arabia'? An answer can, I think, be given. We have found (on xvii. 9, xxviii. 13) that יצחק

[1] Was Naboth really dragged out into the darkness of the night? Read בישמע׳, 'in Ishmael,' a gloss on בחלקת הזאת.

[2] Read ישמעאל, a gloss on צִיָּה.

[3] Read ירחמאל, which is wrongly separated from יהוה; the full divine name was Yahweh-Yerahme'el.

[4] Read ירחמאל, a gloss on חברונה.

[5] The current explanations are indeed 'very questionable' (Gunkel). Schwally (review of Staerk's *Studien*, *Lit. Centr.-blatt*, June 17, 1899) even suggests that פחד may mean 'dead spirit, ghost.'

or ישחק may sometimes be a corruption of אשחור. This is most probably the case here. And if so, should we not look for some other regional name underneath the very improbable פחד? The nearest at hand is חפר, the name of one of the 'sons of Gilead' (Num. xxvi. 33). Ḥepher-Ashḥur might be a gloss on (or variant to) 'Arab-Yarḥam,' underlying 'Abraham.' The result is that we should omit all but the central part ערב ירחם (as variants or glosses), thus obtaining the sense, 'unless the God of Arab-Yarḥam had been for me.' The closing word אמש, *i.e.* 'ישמע, seems to be a gloss on one of the preceding district-names, perhaps on עֲרָב (אבי). We shall see presently (on *vv.* 45, 49) that the God of Arabia was called both Yeraḥme'el and Yahweh.

A troublesome error occurs in *v.* 45 (E), and also, in a complicated form, in *v.* 46 (J). That Jacob should be the expressed or implied subject of the verb is forbidden by the context. יעקב must be wrong. We must not, however, substitute לָבָן for it (cp. Driver). יעקבל in *v.* 46 has come from ירחמאל (like יעקב in Isa. xvii. 5, etc., and קבל-עם in 2 K. xv. 10); this word ought to be combined with אשחור, thus forming the compound name Yeraḥme'el-Ashḥur. This enables us to account for the impossible יעקב in *v.* 44, which is no mere error of a scribe, but has come from ירחמאל; and this 'ירח is the very word which is wanting to complete *v.* 44, which should run, 'And now come, let us make a compact, I and thou, and Yeraḥme'el shall be witness between us both.' This restoration seems to me a very great boon; it gives the key to the subsequent statement that the 'heap' or 'the *maṣṣēbah*' should be witness. For how could a cairn or a stone be a witness unless a divinity were within the cairn or the stone (cp. Gunkel), and who could the divinity be but the God who was common to both parties—Yeraḥme'el the God of Arabia.—*V.* 45 (E) and *v.* 46 (J) also become perfectly clear. They should run thus, 'And he (Laban) took a stone, and set it up as a *maṣṣēbah.* And he (Laban) said, Gather stones,' etc. 'Yeraḥme'el-Ashḥur' remains outside; it is a gloss on the enigmatical 'Yegar-sahadūthā' in *v.* 47 (see note). For the equation אחיו = אשחור, see on xvi. 12, xxv. 18, Hos. xii. 3.

Certainly the riddle of 'Yegar-sahadūthā' (*v.* 47) is a pretty one. Most have supposed that the name, read in accordance with MT., means 'heap of witness,' or 'heap is witness,'[1] and that the cairn received both a Hebrew and an equivalent Aramaic name because it stood on the frontier between Aramaic- and Hebrew-speaking populations. But the Hebrew name of the spot intended was not גִּלְעֵד, but גִּלְעָד, as indeed J, at any rate, surely must mean us to read in *v.* 48 (see Gunkel).[2] And from our present point of view it is easy to make at least a near approach to the true solution of the riddle—a solution which has the twofold merit of being methodical and of harmonising with results attained elsewhere. יגר שהדותא would, in fact, be a perfectly regular transformation of ירח' אשחורת.[3] The whole of *v.* 47 is a gloss on קרא שמו גלעד in *v.* 48. 'Therefore one called its name Gilead,' said the earlier writer; upon this the glossator's comment is, 'Laban called its name Yeraḥ-Ashḥaroth (= Yeraḥme'el-Ashḥur); Jacob called it Gil'ad.' We have seen already that יעקבל אחיו in *v.* 46 represents ירחמאל אשחור, a correction of יגר שה'.

The origin of גלעד has, I venture to think, been too hastily traced to an Arabic word (*ǵal'ad*) meaning 'hard, strong, brave.' Analogy seems rather to suggest that גלעד (like the names read as 'Bashan,' 'Kasdim,' 'Akshaph,' 'Aḳrabbim') is a compound. For גל, cp. גלגל, גליל, גלים; for עד, cp. עדיה, עדיאל, and perhaps אדבאל. גל may be a fragment of גמל; cp. גמליאל, *i.e.* חמליאל (cp. רגם = ירחם, in רגם מלך).

Another riddle is that of 'Miṣpah' (*v.* 49). Wellhausen[4] argues learnedly that Miṣpah in Gilead may originally have been called Maṣṣēbah; he thinks, too, that

[1] Nestle, *Marginalien*, p. 11.

[2] That there was textual corruption in the Aramaic name was pointed out in *E. Bib.*, col. 1627, though the best solution was not given owing to the prejudice that the scene of the story must be on the frontier of the northern Aram.

[3] 'ירח was very early the short for ירחמאל. For אשחורת cp. on אשדות, Num. xxi. 15. With יגר we may possibly compare the 'land of Gari,' Am. Tab. 237, 23 (cp. Hommel, *AHT*, p. 265).

[4] *CH*, 1889, pp. 43 *f.*

the connexion of *vv.* 48-50 is much disturbed by glosses. It may be questioned, however, whether 'Miṣpah' has any right of existence here. המצפה should probably be המצבה (as Sam. actually reads), and אשר אמר which follows has come from בְּאַשֻּׁר אֲרָם, 'in Asshur of Aram' (see on xxii. 2). The words thus read are a misplaced appendage to the gloss in *v.* 47, and state that the *maṣṣēbah* was still to be seen in Asshur-Aram. The words יצף יהוה may therefore be a continuation of the speech of Laban in *v.* 48.

V. 53 *a* has also been found perplexing. ישפטו has been held to indicate a lower mode of thinking characteristic of Laban, and אלהי אביהם to be a gloss 'added for the purpose of softening a polytheistic trait by subsuming the God of Abraham and the God (or gods) of Naḥor under a higher unity' (Driver, after Del., Dillm., etc.). This seems a radical error. Laban and Jacob had the same religion, only the former kept up more superstitious practices than the latter. Abraham himself uses a plural verb with 'Elohim' (xx. 13), certainly not to conciliate polytheistic hearers (Dillm., Driver, etc.). Sound method requires us to hold that אביהם in *v.* 53 *a* has come either from a dittographed אברהם, or from אבירחם, a *correction* of אברהם. Referring to what has been said on *v.* 42, I would read אלהי ערב־ירחם ואלהי נחור. In *v.* 53 *b* we must insert אלהי between ב and חפר (for פחד); and for ערב, אביו יצ׳ אשחור, which may be a gloss on חפר. For 'Naḥor' (= Arab-naḥor) see on xxiv. 10.

LEGEND OF MAHANAIM (GEN. XXXII. 2, 3)

ACCORDING to the MT. of this passage, 'angels of Elohim' met Jacob on his progress, and from his exclamation, 'this is a host (camp) of Elohim,' the place Maḥanaim derived its name (cp. *E. Bib.*, col. 2902, note 1). But surely, if the origin of 'Maḥanaim' were to be explained at all, something more would have been said by the original writer. The text, therefore, must have been mutilated, probably because much that was said was distasteful to a later generation. We most naturally think of a contest between Jacob and a company of inferior divine beings (cp. xxxii. 23 *ff.*). So Gunkel, who is in the main probably right.[1] But can we not improve upon this? In the only other passage of Genesis in which מלאכי אלהים occurs (xxviii. 12), that phrase appears to be not original, but a development out of ירחמאל יהוה. Probably, therefore, the original story spoke of a hostile onset (פגע) of Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh, and of Jacob's permitted victory over him. After this it may have been said that Jacob erected Yeraḥme'el-pillars (see on xxviii. 22), and worshipped. In this case the patriarch's exclamation must have been, not מחנה אל׳ זה, but ירחמ׳ יהוה זה, 'this one is Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh.' To illustrate this, let it be remarked that מחנה דן in Judg. xviii. 12 is probably not the original place-name, but יחמן דן, or the like, where יחמן would be a corruption of ירחמאל. The place-name מחנים also, most probably, arose very early out of יחמנים or חַמָּנים, *i.e.* pillars of Yeraḥme'el.[2] Cp. on מנחת, xxxvi. 23.

[1] Ed. Meyer (p. 275, note 2) dissents, but without giving any reason.

[2] See on Lev. xxvi. 30, and cp. Isa. xvii. 8, where חמנים is coupled with אשרים, *i.e.* sacred symbols of the god Asher or Asshur.

Now, as to geography. Maḥanaim is commonly supposed to have stood in the region beyond the Jordan. There are, however, reasons for thinking that the Maḥanaim of the early narratives may have been in some part of the Arabian border-land. Thus (1), it was the residence of Saul's son and successor 'Ishbosheth' (2 S. ii. 8, 12, 29), and there are serious difficulties in placing this king's residence beyond the Jordan (*Crit. Bib.* p. 253). (2) It was also for a time the residence of David (2 S. xviii. 24 *ff.*), and though the geography of Absalom's revolt may have been manipulated, there are still some indications that the scene of the events of that episode was originally placed in the Arabian border-land. See *e.g.* on 2 S. xvi. 14 *f.*, and xvii. 26, which shows that the land of Gilead, where Maḥanaim lay, was in Arab-Ishmael. (3) It was also the capital of one of Solomon's prefectures (1 K. iv. 14). Now it seems to have been shown[1] with no slight probability that the region divided into prefectures was that possessed by Solomon in the Arabian border-land. On these grounds it is probable that the 'Maḥanaim' (Ḥammanim?) originally meant was not = Miḥnè or Maḥnè in the Jebel 'Ajlun, nor yet the town 'Ajlun itself, but stood on some unrecoverable site far to the south, in the vicinity of the stream called in the present text ירדן, but in the earlier text ירחון (see on *v.* 11). It may be assumed that an important sanctuary existed at Maḥanaim, and that tales were told there about Jacob, such as that only just discernible in *vv.* 2, 3, and that still preserved in its main features in *vv.* 23-33.

[1] See *Crit. Bib.*, and *E. Bib.*, col. 4687, note 1.

JACOB AND ESAU (GEN. XXXII. 4-22)

A LINKING passage. A clear picture of the events cannot be obtained from the traditional text. Evidently the narrative is composite (JE), but the difficulties of the chapter are complicated by corruptions of the text and geographical misunderstandings. First, as to the latter. It has already been remarked by Gunkel and Winckler that the land of Edom is too far away from Maḥanaim and Penuel for Jacob's messengers to return so quickly, followed at no great distance by Esau himself. Gunkel has suggested that the domain of Esau may at first have been placed much more to the north, and Winckler even thinks that both Abraham and Jacob were moved from the north to the south by the Yahwist,[1] and that the Seir referred to in xxxii. 4, xxxiii. 14, 16, was in N. Israel (cp. Judg. iii. 26), and is the same that is spoken of by Abd-ḫiba of Jerusalem (Am. Tab. 181, 26) in the phrase 'from (the region of) Shêri to (the city of) Ginti-kirmil.'

From our present point of view, however, a different view is more plausible. As we have seen (on xiv. 6), 'Seir' is probably a very early modification of 'Asshur.' It is therefore not impossible that Esau's domain may have been a part of the great Asshurite country, other parts of which were occupied by Laban and Jacob respectively. We may add (1) that it seems to follow from *v.* 7 and xxxiii. 1 (see next note) that the district from which Esau came could also be described as a part of Ishmaelite Arabia, and (2) that one or both of the geographical phrases at the end of *v.* 4 (as also שעירה, 'to Seir,' xxxiii. 14, 16) may be due to a supplementing scribe.

[1] *AOF*, xxi. 265, 439.

We now pass on to a great difficulty, of which none of the recent critics, except Steuernagel, attempts any explanation. How came Esau to have four hundred men at his beck and call (xxxii. 7, xxxiii. 1), and what was his object in bringing so large a band with him? The narrative throws no light on the four hundred. It does not call them either his 'trained' men or his 'kinsmen,' but simply 'men,' and allows us to infer that Esau's sole object in coming was to greet his brother. Steuernagel (*Einwand.* p. 105) suggests that the notice of the arrival of Esau and his band has been transferred hither from another context, in which 'Jacob' meant 'the Jacob-tribe,' and 'Esau' meant 'the Esau-tribe,' and that Num. xx. 14-21, where the king of Edom refuses to allow Israel to pass, is parallel, in so far as it is based upon an earlier narrative, which must have related a hostile encounter between Edom and Israel. Before making such an arbitrary conjecture, however, it would have been better to examine the text of xxxii. 7 and xxxiii. 1 more narrowly. Experience shows that numerals are very apt to be the disguise of ethnics. ארבע מאות איש should, according to parallels (see on xv. 13), be a scribe's production out of the ill-written words ערב אתמול אשור,[1] while עמו, which rightly stands first in xxviii. 1, probably comes from מער.[2] Thus we get as the original reading '[from] Arabia of Ishmael-Asshur.' (The preposition מִ has dropped out, and ער has been dittographed.)

The reader will now, I hope, recognise the original form of the story of the meeting of the brothers. It must have been to this effect—that, to improve the relations between himself and Esau, the younger brother sent messengers to the elder in Arab-Ishmael, to announce that he was on his way home, having prospered in his years of hard service. The messengers returned, and stated that they had seen Esau, and that with the perfection of courtesy he had started from Arab-Ishmael to meet Jacob half-way.

[1] אתמול and תמול often represent ישמעאל.

[2] The meaning is that in xxxiii. 1 the MS. on which the late redactor relied gave wrongly, not מֵערב, but מערערב. This the redactor converted into ועמו ארבע, while in xxxii. 7 he changed the order of the words, and wrote וארבע מאות איש עמו.

There was nothing in this to perplex one so confident in his superior shrewdness as Jacob, who at once made preparations for sending a large present before him to propitiate Esau, whose wrath he still feared. Jacob's calculated liberality, supported by his extravagant compliments and self-humiliation, took effect on the dull-minded Esau, who genially accepted the present, and, assuming that Jacob would pay him a visit, offered to lead the way. The crafty Jacob, however, found a good excuse (see on xxxiii. 13 *f.*) for getting rid of his dangerous brother, whose fit of generosity might not last long. He proposed first of all to move gently on to Asshur-Yerahme'el, where he was at home, and where he would deposit his family in safety, and then pay the proposed visit (which he hoped would never come off) to Esau.

The humorous character of all this will not escape the reader, and Gunkel has well pointed out how strongly the narrative contrasts with the inwardness of the prayer in xxxii. 10-13, which is obviously a later insertion. As to the details of the prayer, there are four points requiring to be mentioned here. (1) The titles given to Yahweh in *v.* 10 are reduced by a keen textual criticism to one, viz. אלהי ערב אשחור, 'God of Arab-Ashhur' (see on xxviii. 13). (2) The name ירדן should rather be ירחון (see on xiii. 10). (3) The supposed popular proverb in *v.* 12 is most probably a corruption of בני ישמעאל[1] (transposing). On this point it should be added that the phrase 'the sons of Ishmael' is an interpolated gloss on 'Esau.' The glossator had before him the false reading 'with him four hundred men,' and took these men to be Ishmaelite freebooters. (4) The reference to the sand in *v.* 13 presupposes a reading in xxii. 17 which has, I think, been shown to be false; a sufficient proof of the lateness of the inserted passage.

[1] Cp. Hos. x. 14 (end), where read בני אשתר ישמעאל, 'the men of Ashtār-Ishmael.'

THE WRESTLING-MATCH (GEN. XXXII. 23-33)

HERE is a severe test, for we have come to the story of the successful wrestling of Jacob—himself a hero—with an antagonist who is no less than divine. Very naturally it gave offence to some of its ancient readers; hence it is omitted in the Book of Jubilees. Indeed, except when spiritualised by poet or preacher, it is likely to be equally uncongenial to modern students. Still, we must not, as historical students, be tempted to despise this antique narrative, nor refuse the effort required to comprehend it. Indeed, though antique, it is not strictly primitive; the mythical element which it contains must have been considerably toned down before the Yahwist and the Elohist could accept it.

First of all, however, let us examine the geographical framework, remembering, as always, that the letters of the traditional text are no more authoritative than the vowel-points. We have seen already that, if Maḥanaim is to be placed in the north-east, the journey to that place from Seir is too long for Esau to have taken, whether out of mere complaisance or for any other reason. The stream, therefore, beside which Jacob found himself can neither be the Yarmuk (Wellh.) nor the Nahr ez-Zerḳa[1] (Dillm., Driver, etc.).

Its name Yabboḳ, too, has been much misunderstood. It means neither the 'profuse' nor the 'gurgling' stream;[2] but is to be connected with the name of a place, יקב, mentioned in Judg. vii. 25, not far from the ירדן, or rather the

[1] See Smend, *ZATW*, 1902, p. 142, note 1; G. A. Smith, *HG*, pp. 583 *f.*; cp. Eus. in *OS* 266, 80.

[2] *BDB* apparently suggest this. The early narrators are supposed

ירחון (see on xiii. 11), and not far also, though on the other side of the stream, from סכות (*i.e.* סלכת). Both יבק and יקב[1] belong to the same group as יעקב (see below), and are worn-down forms of ירחם (Yarḥam = Yerahme'el). Now, though it is admittedly quite possible for a place and a stream in N.E. Palestine to have borne a name of N. Arabian origin—for the N. Arabian immigrants carried their names with them,—yet other considerations strongly favour the view that the stream יבק was in the N. Arabian border-land, and was a tributary of the stream called Yarḥon. Like so many other corruptions of ירחם, the form in question early acquired an independent existence. See further, on Num. xxi. 24, Dt. ii. 37.

At a later point we find Jacob arriving at Peniel (*v.* 31) or Penuel (*v.* 32) and Succoth (xxxiii. 17; cp. Judg. viii. 5, 8, 16 *f.*). Here, too, the name סכת (סכות) favours, though it does not, strictly speaking, require, the N. Arabian theory. For Succath (Succoth) should be Saccath; it is most probably identical with Salecath, *i.e.* Ashcalath.[2] It is very possible that the original story referred to the famous Asshurite city called Salecath (cp. on xx. 16, Dt. iii. 10). It is true, the narrator explains the name as 'booths,' and this agrees with the old explanation of חג סכת[ה] as 'feast of booths.' Originally, however, the 'feast' was that of Salecath or Salekith, *i.e.* of the goddess of Ashcal or Asshur-Yerahme'el, properly called Ashtart (see on Lev. xxiii. 34). The origin of Peniel is less easily determined. The name must be old; it may occur, mis-written, in the name-list of Shoshenk.[3] But though it was early explained (see *v.* 31) as פְּנֵי אֵל ('face of God')—a possible title of the divine Wrestler, or, as others think, suggested by the appearance of the mountain (if Peniel was on a mountain)[4]—yet it is practically certain that the

(*e.g.* by G. A. Smith, *l.c.*, and Driver, Hast. *DB*, p. 350 *a*, note 1) to have interpreted it the 'wrestling' stream.

[1] MT. calls the place יקב זאב, but ו, like בעז, בוז, זבל, comes from ישמעאל, and is merely a variant to יקב. See *Crit. Bib.* on Judg. vii. 25.

[2] Cp. סבלת and ש; סרון and ש.

[3] W. M. Müller, *As. u. Eur.* p. 168.

[4] The latter view is held by Gunkel (p. 322); the profile of a huge face may have been imagined, for which analogies can be offered.

connexion with פנים is illusory, and probable that פניאל is an expansion of the old tribal name נפל, for the probable origin of which see on vi. 4.

To fix the sites of these places is entirely beyond us; even שכם (again in xxxiii. 18) and ביתאל (where Hosea, as we shall see, apparently places the wrestling) cannot be identified. But if we can admit that the localities referred to were in N. Arabia, the general consistency of these narratives will be preserved. It may be added that if the same Saccath (= Salecath) is referred to in Ex. xii. 37, this place must have been situated not far from the border of Miṣrim or Muṣri.

Let us now pass on to the story itself. That the wrestling in which Jacob engaged is meant to be understood literally, is undeniable;[1] and from a critical point of view it is only natural to compare the classical passages in which gods and men mingle in the fray, also, more especially, the primitive and wide-spread myth of the halting god.[2] Jacob is evidently regarded as the possessor of enormous strength (cp. xxviii. 18, xxix. 10, xxxi. 45). Possibly this story formed the close of a series of tales which recounted the feats of that mighty hero. One may at least say that it well deserved to do so from its exceptional character. And what was the object of the story? Probably it was to show that Jacob had won the favour of the God of the N. Arabian land which he had entered, or, perhaps, that his tribe had full religious sanction for its occupation of it.[3] These blessings, according to the legend here adopted, were obtained by a successful contest. The event took place at 'Penuel,' where, as well as at Maḥanaim, the priests and worshippers at the sanctuary loved to tell the legend. Possibly, as Gunkel (p. 323) suggests, a special rite of dancing (like limping) was

Ed. Meyer (after Halévy) in *E. Bib.*, col. 3747, thinks that פן בעל in Phœnician inscriptions is a place-name. It may be this, and yet פן need not mean 'face.'

[1] I see no reason for supposing that the original narrator thought of a dream-vision as in xxviii. 12 (Jeremias, *ATAO*, p. 235).

[2] See *Folklore*, 1902, No. 1; Stucken, *Astralmythen*, p. 152.

[3] This seems better than the view given in *E. Bib.*, 'Wrestling.'

practised there[1] (cp. *v.* 32). If so, the Penuel sanctuary must have had a wide influence, for the prophets of Baal (Yerahme'el?) in general appear to have adopted the rite[2] (1 K. xviii. 26), and the spring festival called the Pesaḥ (our 'Passover') may have derived its name from such limping or leaping dances.[3]

It is noteworthy that the term for 'wrestling' (נפתל, see on xxx. 8) does not occur in the narrative; the word which has probably taken its place (נעקב) means 'to use tricks.' The MT., it is true, has (in *v.* 25) ויאבק, but the explanations of the supposed root אבק are most precarious, and it is needful to correct the text. The gain is manifest. On this last occasion (*v.* 29) of Jacob's bearing this name, legend finds a new reason for it. It means 'the tricksome' (cp. Jer. ix. 3), and the last and greatest of Jacob's artifices, or exhibitions of cleverness, was when he put forth the craft of an Odysseus against a divine Man. Whether the narrator thoroughly sympathises with this, we cannot positively say. The shiftiness of the nomad[4] was slow to disappear. If the narrator did feel some qualms at Jacob's action (cp. Hos. xii. 4), he did not care to spoil his story by indicating this. His object was not to criticise but to glorify the patriarch, and this he did, not by a modernising fiction of his own, but by adopting an old and venerated legend. At this turning-point in Jacob's career, it was fitting that his name, like Abram's, should be changed. But the old name was not to be thrown aside as ignoble. As W. M. Müller has pointed out, it was, according to the original story, Jacob who resorted to an artifice, like Odysseus in *Il.* xxiii. 725-727; *i.e.* the subject of the verb in *v.* 26 *a* is Jacob.[5] This seems to me to be confirmed by

[1] Land (*De Gids*, Oct. 1871, p. 20, note 1). He thinks (comparing the Arabic *nasā*) that the name of the mysterious Being with whom Jacob strove was Menaššeh, *i.e.* one who injures the hip-sinew (cp. *vv.* 26, 33). Surely מְנַסֶּה, 'one who tests,' would be more seemly.

[2] See references in *E. Bib.*, 'Dance,' col. 1000, note 2.

[3] So Toy; cp. *E. Bib.*, col. 999.

[4] On the shiftiness of Jacob and David, see Cheyne, *Aids to Criticism*, pp. 34 *f.* note 2.

[5] See W. M. M. *As. u. Eur.* p. 163, note 1, who is followed by

the parallel account in Hosea (xii. 4, etc.), to which we shall return.

And who can Jacob's antagonist have been? Two Midrashic statements were current in later times. According to one, it was the angel-prince of Edom;[1] according to another, the archangel Michael.[2] But the narrative itself answers our question. *V.* 29 in MT. runs thus, 'And he said, Thy name shall no more be called Jacob, but Israel, for thou hast contended with Elohim and with men, and hast prevailed.' Even without criticising the text, we may venture to guide ourselves provisionally by this statement. It was evidently a superhuman being, though in human form, with whom Jacob wrestled.

But must we not allow ourselves to use our already-gained experience in textual criticism? Plainly אלהים (god) and אנשים (men) ought to be synonymous, and if they are not, אנשים at any rate must be corrupt. Both אנוש (see on iv. 26) and אנשים (see on 2 S. vii. 14), equally with שמן (cp. שמעון, and see on Isa. x. 27, Ps. xcii. 11), are well-established corruptions of ישמעאל. Does not this furnish a hint as to the name of Jacob's antagonist? We have seen already that מלאך in the phrases מל׳ יהוה and מל׳ אלהים has most probably come from ירחמאל, which not only designated the Yerahme'elite race, but was also the name of the god, or one of the gods, whom the race worshipped. It is also approximately certain that in the much-disputed Jacob-passage in Hos. xii. 4, 5 (see below) the antagonist of Jacob is called Ashhur, Elohim, and Mal'ak (or some other form of Yerahme'el). Lastly, we have seen it to be probable that אלהום itself is sometimes[3] either an alteration or a corruption (or half one and half the other) of ירחמאל, or at any rate of some form of that name which had long

B. Luther, *ZATW*, 1901, p. 66, Ed. Meyer, and Holzinger. The view is not inconsistent with the fact that *v.* 26 *b* distinctly states that it was the hollow of Jacob's thigh which became out of joint. This notice evidently comes from another narrator, and *v.* 27 connects admirably with *v.* 26 *a*. In *v.* 26 *b*, of course, read בְּהֵעָקְבוֹ עִמּוֹ, 'when he tried a trick with him.'

[1] *Bereshith rabba*, lxxvii. *f.*

[2] Targ. Jon. on Gen. xxxii. 24; see pp. 59 *f.*

[3] But hardly in the phrase מלאך [ה]אלהים.

since acquired an independent existence. It follows that no view is so probable as this—that the personage with whom Jacob, according to the original story, contended was the second person of the divine duad or triad—Yerahme'el, also called Ishmael (see on xvi. 10), and that in *v.* 29 the former name underlies אלהים, and the latter אנשים.

In *v.* 30 we find Jacob sharing our own curiosity as to the name of his opponent, but receiving, as the text now stands, an evasive answer.[1] This is surprising, if we assign the narrative to a single narrator, and if we accept the criticism of אלהים in the preceding paragraph. For in *v.* 29, according to our revised text, it is said, 'thou hast contended with Yerahme'el [with Ishmael], and hast prevailed'; *i.e.* the divinity, unasked, communicates his name to his vanquisher. The solution of the problem is that *v.* 29 comes from one source, and *vv.* 30 *f.* from another. From the latter passage it is plain that though Jacob knows that he has to do with a divinity, he does not know that divinity's name. It is effective dramatically to represent Jacob as asking for the sacred name, and this the narrator enjoys. But he is well aware of the name all the time. Both J and E are fully persuaded that in Israel's heroic age the second member of the divine duad or triad frequently intervened in human affairs (cp. on xvi. 10). And, to confirm this, we find in the parallel passage Judg. xiii. 19 (see note) an early glossator appending to the evasive question of the divine Speaker ('why askest thou for my name?') the note 'it is Yerahme'el,' which has intruded in a corrupt form into the text. It was thus no mere local deity—the *numen* of Penuel[2]—over whom Jacob prevailed, but that great Being

[1] The idea is that to communicate the true name of a god is dangerous. He who has this name can dispose of the power of its bearer (cp. Dieterich, *Mithrasliturgie*, p. 112). Hence the deep significance of swearing, *e.g.* by Ashmath of Shimron (Ashmath in Am. viii. 14 = Ishme'elith, the feminine side of the god Ishmael). In legends connected with cultus either the true name or an effective substitute had to be revealed (cp. on xvii. 1). Gunkel thinks that originally *v.* 30 contained a revelation of the true name of the divine wrestler, and compares El 'Ōlām and El Beth-el. But see note 2.

[2] This is against the view of Land, *De Gids* (above), and apparently

who was first to the Arabians, but only second to the better Israelites, who was conquered by Jacob, only because he willed to be conquered—because he willed to strengthen Jacob's confidence both in himself and in the divinity. Hence Jacob says, 'I have confronted Yerahme'el (later text, Elohim) face to face, and I have come away alive' (*v.* 31).[1]

That Jacob's antagonist is indeed divine appears further from xxxv. 10, where the giver of the new name 'Israel' is called Elohim (originally Yerahme'el). In this case the gift is connected with the theophany at Bethel,[2] and the question arises whether in the original form of the narratives 'Bethel' or 'Beth-on' did not mean the same place as Penuel; for Bethel and Beth-on, as we have seen, are, like Tubal, Nebat, and Beten, merely popular modifications of Ishmael.

There is yet another record, besides xxxv. 10, of a traditional statement that the contest with Elohim, or Mikael, or Ashhur, took place at Bethel or Ono. This is in Hos. xii. 4, 5. The passage as handed down in MT. is in many ways strange. What is to be said, *e.g.*, of the statement that 'in the womb he (Jacob) supplanted his brother'? The next line is rendered by Harper, 'and in his man's strength he contended with God'; Harper makes this the first line of a later insertion. The complication of the exegesis forced upon those who accept the text ought to be a stimulus to a keener textual criticism. I have ventured to attempt this, and strict application of new methods brings me to this result.

In Beth-on he used a trick with Ashhur,
In Ono he strove with Elohim.
[Gloss 1. He strove with Mal'ak (Yerahme'el), and prevailed;
He wept and made supplication to him.]
[Gloss 2. Bethel of Ishmael; Arab-Ishmael.]

of Gunkel. The view of Robertson Smith (*Rel. Sem.* p. 456) is still less correct.

[1] Stade's view (*Bibl. Theol. des A.T.* i. 58) is that Jacob overcame a Canaanite local divinity named Israel (= the fighting El).

[2] Possibly the account of the theophany was originally much fuller, and resembled that in chap. xxviii.

We see here that even in the time of the glossator the geography of the old legend was understood, and further, that the identity of the divine antagonist of Jacob with Mal'ak (= Yerahme'el) was realised. The reference to 'weeping and making supplication' shows that the legend had begun to be spiritualised; the striving had now become a great upheaval of the spirit in prayer.

And now as to the origin of the names Jacob (יעקב, or [five times] יעקוב) and Israel (ישראל). It is useless to attempt a solution, if we assume the present forms of the names to be correct, and if we adhere to the prevalent theory that a large proportion of Semitic names from the very first embodied statements with regard to the Deity. Sound method requires us to group יעקב with those Hebrew names which have most of the same letters, or at any rate letters akin to them—such as יבק (*v.* 23), יקב (Judg. vii. 25), עקוב (Ezra ii. 42, 45, etc.), יעקבה (1 Chr. iv. 36), יקבצאל[1] (Neh. xi. 25), אחיקם, אדניקם, יעקן (see on xxxvi. 27), and other similar Semitic names such as עקבאל and עקבן,[2] Ikibum[3] (son of Abishar), Aḳabbi-ili, to which others may be added from Johns, *Deeds*, iii. 164. Consistently with our results thus far, we cannot doubt that the common origin of all these forms is ירחם, which, with the formative ending, becomes ירחמאל. The study of Phœnician, Aramaic, and Palmyrene names in the light of our discoveries, suggests that the Semitic parallels to יעקב have the same origin. It is enough, therefore, to record the favourite interpretation (see *e.g.* Hommel, *Gr.* p. 167, note 6) of 'Jacob' as 'he (God) rewards.' But another favourite view seems to be probably correct, viz. that the name once had the fuller form יעקבאל. Ya'kub-ilu has indeed been found on Babylonian contract-tablets of Ḫammurabi's time, and a Hyksos king Ya'kub-ilu is admitted by Spiegelberg. Further, in the name-list of Thotmes III. (No. 102) occurs, a name which may perhaps represent Ya'kob-'el.

Next as to ישראל. This is not 'God rules' (Knob., Dillm.), and 'God strives' (Dillm., Nöldeke, E. Meyer, WRS, etc.), or

[1] צאל, like אצל in Zech. xiv. 5, comes from שאל (cp. ישמעאל); see *Crit. Bib.* on Josh. xv. 21.

[2] For עקבן (= עקמל) see Cooke, p. 404. [3] Cp. on עכבור, xxxvi. 39.

'Let God strive' (Gray), or 'God flashes'[1] (Vollers), or 'God persists' or 'perseveres'[2] (Driver, Hast. *DB*, p. 530 *a*). These theories (*a*) are based upon an erroneous theory of the original or primary meaning of Semitic names, and (*b*) the best-known of them take their notion of שר from the legend of the wrestling. Independently of Hommel I have long arrived at the conclusion that the second syllable was שׁוּ. This enables us to make the patriarch's two names entirely parallel, for, comparing אשׂריאל, Num. xxvi. 31, and אשׂראל, 1 Chr. iv. 16, and אשׂראלה, 1 Chr. xxv. 2, it is difficult not to hold that the first letter was א.[3] This gives us as the original form אַשֻּׁרִיאל or אַשּׁוּראל. In accordance with this I have long recognised in the famous יְשֻׁרוּן a development of אַשּׁוּר, *i.e.* the N. Arabian region called Asshur or Ashḥur, and in סֵפֶר הַיָּשָׁר, Josh. x. 13, etc., a distortion of ס׳ אַשְׁחֻר,[4] a book relating to Ashḥur, *i.e.* to that part of Ashḥur which was occupied by Israel. In this connexion, too, יֵשֶׁר, the name of a son of Caleb, 1 Chr. ii. 18, and יְשַׂרְאֵלָה (another form of אשׂר׳), 1 Chr. xxv. 14, may be mentioned. We can now understand how Ahab in an Assyrian inscription comes to be called Sir'lai, and Israel to be represented on the Merneptah-stele by Y-si-rí'l.[5] For other views of 'Israel' see *E. Bib.*, 'Jacob,' § 6, on which note that Yizraḥ, too, is a deformation of Ashḥur; also Steuernagel, *Einwand.* pp. 61 *f.* The name 'Seraiah' may also be referred to here (see p. 288).

With regard to the significance of the traditional change

[1] *Arch. f. Rel.-wiss.* ix., 1906, p. 184.

[2] Driver would render שרית in xxxii. 29 'thou hast persevered.' The sense is unsuitable, and far-fetched (Ar. *šariya*, in iii., 'to persist or persevere against another'). Surely 'thou hast prevailed' implies 'thou hast striven.'

[3] 'Asriel' is a son of Gilead (the N. Arabian); Asarel, of Yehallelel (*i.e.* Yeraḥme'el); Asarelah, of Asaph (a N. Arabian name; see *Book of Psalms*(2), Introd. p. xlii.).

[4] In *E. Bib.*, 'Jasher' and 'Jeshurun,' it is supposed that another form of ישראל was ישרון, from which came a shorter form ישר (Yēsher?). The 'Book of the Righteous' has in this case come from 'Book of Yesher (= Israel).' So Erbt (*Die Hebräer*), unaware of his predecessor. In *Crit. Bib.*, however, it is shown that הישר comes from אשחור (Ashḥur).

[5] Cp. Hommel, *Gr.* pp. 167 *f.*, note 6; Lagarde, *Uebersicht*, p. 132; Kittel, *Chronicles* (*SBOT*, Heb.), p. 58.

of name, I think that some recent critics have been too subtle. It does not, *e.g.*, mean that the Jacob-tribe, after becoming fused with the Rachel-tribe, required and received a new name, viz. Israel (so Steuern.), but is simply a legendary expression of the fact that Israel originally dwelt in a land which had the two synonymous designations Yerahme'el and Asshur (cp. on chap. xvii.). Jacob-Israel is the hero of the region called (from its two divinities) Asshur-Yerahme'el, just as Esau (another corruption of Asshur) is the hero of that part of Asshur which was called Seir or Arab-Edom.

The question of the analysis of the sources has been treated most recently by B. Luther (*ZATW* xxi. 65 *ff.*), Holzinger, Gunkel, and Ed. Meyer (*Die Isr.* pp. 57 *f.*). The most important variation is that in *v.* 26 *a* (see above). The artifice is used there by Jacob; in *v.* 26 *b*, by the divinity.

THE MEETING OF THE BROTHERS
(GEN. XXXIII. 1-17)

JACOB and Esau meet, after which Esau returns to Seir, and Jacob moves on to Succoth (?). Note the generosity ascribed to Esau, whom Jacob recognises for the first time as his lord (*v.* 3; cp. Am. Tab. 51, 3, etc.). The statement suggests that the legend came from a sanctuary visited by Edomites as well as Israelites.[1]

The narrative in the main is assigned to J. Notice, however, that in *v.* 14 all from לאטי to הילדים is due, in its present form, to the redactor, who did his best with a corrupt

[1] Holzinger, *Genesis*, p. 212.

text.[1] Originally geographical glosses stood here. לאטי (like אט in 1 K. xxi. 27, Hos. xi. 4, and לאט in 2 S. xviii. 5, 1 K. xxi. 27, Isa. viii. 6, Job xv. 11) most probably comes from ישמעאל = אתבעל, while לרגל (cp. לרגלו, Isa. xli. 2; לרגליו, Ex. iv. 25; ברגליו, Judg. v. 15; also רגלים, 2 S. xvii. 27), מלאכה (see on 1 S. xv. 9, and cp. מינאל), and הילדים (cp. on ילידי, xiv. 14) come from ירחמאל. אשר לפני is traceable to אִשֶּׁר פניאל. Thus we get—omitting the gloss 'Yerahme'el' in its various forms, due to the ignorance of the scribes, and the synonym 'Ishmael,'—'and I will move on slowly (אתנהלה) to Asshur-Peniel (or Asshur-Lapân? see above), until I come to my lord, to Seir.' Jacob proposes, perhaps, to deposit his family in safety, and then to pay a visit to Esau. He is only too glad to put off the visit till a more convenient time comes—if it ever will come!

I may here offer two minor but not, I hope, uninteresting textual corrections. It has been noticed by Gunkel that *v.* 4 is overfull; he therefore supposes ויחבקהו and וישקהו to be isolated fragments of E's writing. The latter word, however, is shown by the six superlinear dots to be a suspicious reading.[2] Several MSS. of 𝔊 do not recognise it. Obviously it is a miswritten and misplaced dittograph of וישתחו (see *v.* 3). As to ויחב׳, it has hardly less certainly grown out of a miswritten יעקב.[3] Dillmann has already noticed that in xlv. 14, xlvi. 29, 'falling on the neck' is followed immediately by 'weeping.' If that is not the case here, it is a sign that the text needs examination.

Before proceeding to the very difficult Shechem-narrative, the name Sukkoth (*v.* 17) needs explanation. It can hardly have meant 'booths,' but comes from סלכת, *i.e.* אשכלת (the feminine of אשכל, see on xiv. 13, and cp. on x. 14). Salekath was an important commercial centre (see on xx. 16, xxiii. 15 *f.*, and below, on *v.* 19). It is possible—if our

[1] Gunkel's paraphrase is too bold, nor is *BDB* at all satisfactory. How can רגל mean 'pace'? And לאטי, 'according to my gentleness'? And does the latter rendering suit the context?

[2] Lagarde (*GGA*, 1870, p. 1560) in a review of Olshausen's emendations, praises this scholar for not excising וישקהו, but admits that either ויש׳ or ויה׳, 'which are suspiciously like one another,' was not read by 𝔊.

[3] Gunkel finds a sportive reference to Yabboḳ. But יעקב is even nearer to ויחב׳ than יבק, and יעקב and יבק have a common origin.

restoration of *v.* 14 *b* is correct—that Jacob meant Salekath (= Ashḥur-Yerahme'el) in his reply to Esau's invitation to accompany him; probable, too—if *v.* 17 and *v.* 18 represent two parallel traditions,—that the same place is meant by Sukkoth (Salekath) in *v.* 17 and by whatever place-name we consider the narrator to have used in *v.* 18 *a*. See further, on Dt. iii. 10, Lev. xxiii. 34, 40.

JACOB'S PURCHASE OF LAND (GEN. XXXIII. 18-20)

JACOB arrives at Shechem (or rather Shalem), purchases a plot of ground, and erects a sacred stone. The passage forms the introduction to the Dinah-legend in chap. xxxiv. It is necessary, therefore, that the land should be acquired by Jacob. There is, however, some reason to think that the original tradition may have assigned the acquisition of it to Joseph, who was certainly buried there[1] (Josh. xxiv. 30).

That Jacob arrived at Shechem 'safe and sound' is true enough (cp. xxviii. 21), but the ancients did not make such trivial remarks. And certainly, however the opening clause of *v.* 18 be understood, the construction is unusual, and may justly excite suspicion. May not—must not—שָׁלֵם, in spite of the large dissent of the moderns, be a place-name (so 𝔊, Pesh., Eus., Jer., but not Onk.)? From our present point of view, two results, already attained, have to be remembered—(1) that in xii. 6 (revised text) Abram is said to have come 'to Yerahme'el-Shakram' (the exact form of the name may be left open); and (2) that שלם (see on xxxiv. 21, xiv. 18), like שלום (see on Mic. v. 4), is likely to

[1] Meyer, *op. cit.* pp. 277, 288.

be a corruption of ישמעאל.[1] Most probably, therefore, we should render, 'and Jacob came to Shalem (= Ishmael), a city of Shechem (Shakram).' This Shalem must have been an important place, near to, if not even identical with, Sukkoth (Salekath). It was situated in Shakram, *i.e.* the region called Ashḥur-Aram (cp. on xii. 6, on xlviii. 22, and on דמשק, xv. 2). To this was added from P, 'which is in the land of Canaan' (see on x. 6). The southern Canaan may, in fact, have been a part of the wide region called Ashḥur. Cp. the remark in xii. 6, that 'the Canaanites were then in the land.'

Then, in *v.* 19, what is the meaning of the phrase, בני חמור אבי ש׳? Is it correct that 'the aristocracy of the town (Judg. ix. 28) called themselves sons of Ḥămôr,' *i.e.* 'of the he-ass'?[2] That the phrase 'benê Ḥămôr' may have been sportively so explained is highly probable. So an important post-exilic Jewish clan was called the benê Parʿosh, *i.e.*, superficially viewed, 'sons of Flea.' Knowing, however, that רחם (1 Chr. ii. 44) is an abbreviation of ירחם,[3] can we hesitate to explain חמור (as well as Ass. *ḥimâru*)[4] as = חמאר (cp. ראמה), *i.e.* ירחמאל? This means that one of the various branches of the Yeraḥme'elite race took as its name one of the many corruptions of 'Yeraḥme'el.' In xlviii. 22, instead of Ḥămôr, we find האמרי. Now אמרי, like ארמי, may ultimately come from ירחמאלי. Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Hamor.'

And why should אבי שכם be added? Here the scholars differ. Some say that a later hand must have inserted these words, because in the Dinah-legend (chap. xxxiv.) Ḥămôr is the name of a person, not, as here, of a clan. Others, that אבי here means 'founder' (cp. 1 Chr. ii. 21, etc., and especially Judg. ix. 28). This compels us to examine the passages in which אבי occurs in connexion with a clan-

[1] Wellhausen (*CH*[2], p. 316, note 1) arbitrarily changes שלם into שכם —'Jacob came to Shechem, the city of (the person) Shechem.' In 1906, Winckler suggests 'Shalem the city of Shechem,' *i.e.* Shalem is the earlier name of Shechem. A forced explanation!

[2] Robertson Smith, *Journ. of Philology*, ix. 94.

[3] Shema, Yorḳeam, and Shammai are as obviously Yeraḥme'elite or Ishmaelite names.

[4] Johns, *AJSL*, July 1902, p. 253.

name or a place-name, and our result is (see on iv. 20, x. 21, xxii. 21, Judg. ix. 28) that אבי in such cases has come from עבר, *i.e.* ערב (cp. on x. 24). Certainly א׳ ש׳ is a gloss, but it has no harmonistic object. It stands for ערב ש׳, 'Arabia of Shechem (Shakram),' which is a gloss describing where the tribe of the Ḥămôrites dwelt.

So the purchase of the plot of ground where Joseph was to be buried (Josh. xxiv. 32) was effected. And what was the price? The MT. says מֵאָה קְשִׂיטָה. Here the old methods of criticism fail us. To make progress, we must follow the parallel of xxiii. 15 *f.* (see note) and correct מאה into מְנֵה ('a minæ of'), if we should not take a further hint and read אַרְבַּע מְנֹת, 'four minæ.' קשיטה (also in Job xlii. 11;[1] Josh. xxiv. 32 is imitative) is traced in *E. Bib.*, col. 2659, to כמיש[כר]; מ and ט confounded. But it is more probable that ק׳, like סכות, is a corruption of סלכת. Thus the passage becomes, 'And he bought . . . for a mina [or, for four minæ] of Sakkath.' The mina of Salekath in the south was as much a standard as that of Karkemish in the north. Cp. on xx. 13. The traditional view of *kesitah* is at any rate very hazardous.[2]

V. 20 remains. With Wellh. (*CH*[(2)], p. 50, note 1) I read מצבה (xxxv. 14, 20) for מזבח and לה for לו. This is because of ויצב; cp. also the 'great stone' set up by Joshua (Josh. xxiv. 26) at Shechem. Otherwise מזבח need not be wrong; cp. the Syrian inscription beginning *Διὶ βωμῷ μεγάλῳ*.[3] And what was the name of the god and the stone, or the god-stone, in *v.* 20? Can we, in spite of B. Luther,[4] leave אל אלהי יש׳ unquestioned? אל by the side of אלהי and ישראל (whether as a personal or a tribal name) are surely improbable.[5] Yahweh, indeed, could not be expected from the Elohist; here B. Luther is right. But is this enough to justify אל by itself? ישראל appears to

[1] Read [מְנֵה זהב אחד] מְנֵה סלכת אחד; two competing readings.

[2] I fear this will not please Mr. Cowley, who supports the traditional rendering of *kesitah*, 'lamb,' by the word כבש in the Assuan papyri. This is the name of a coin worth 10 shekels, explained by Mr. Cowley 'lamb-coin.' But כבש is, like ק׳ש׳, a problem.

[3] Ed. Meyer, *op. cit.* pp. 113, 548.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 295.

[5] 𝔊 ἐπεκαλέσατο τὸν θεὸν Ισραηλ, evading the difficulty.

me to be a gloss on ירחמאל (in xxi. 33 disguised as עולם), ירחמ׳ may underlie אלהי as well as אלהים. Thus we get אל ירחמאל [ישראל], 'the God of Yeraḥme'el [of Israel].' Winckler arbitrarily substitutes אֵל קִנֶּה. It is noteworthy that in Judg. viii. 33, ix. 4 (MT.), the God of Shechem is called 'Baal-berith,' underneath which probably lies the compound divine name 'Yeraḥme'el 'Arbîth' (see p. 18, note 4).

THE FATE OF DINAH (GEN. XXXIV.)

THE legend of Dinah is partly parallel to the legends of the fortunes of Sarah and Ribḳah in Miṣrim and Gerar. In all three the purpose of Yahweh to guard the purity of the chosen family seemed in danger of being thwarted; in all three the attempt of those who opposed it was brought to nought. The Dinah-legend was evidently thought of much importance, both as a proof of the watchful care of Yahweh and because it had to do with Shechem, which was, in early times, at any rate for the tribes of Joseph, a great political centre. It was therefore handed down in two versions. Even an approximately final analysis of the section has not, however, been arrived at. At present many critics hold that in both versions of the story circumcision was a condition either of the marriage of Shechem and Dinah only, or of a general *connubium*; *i.e.* in the first case Shechem alone, and in the second all the male freemen of the city, consented to become like the sons of Jacob and be circumcised. Those, however, who hold this view are confronted by a serious difficulty. How can either J or E (whose work was welded together, and perhaps also

retouched, by a redactor) have represented Jacob and his sons as circumcised, if Ex. iv. 25 *ff.* and Josh. v. 2 *ff.* really give a tradition of the introduction of circumcision among the benê Israel? It is not a satisfactory answer that there may have been two different traditions, one representing circumcision among the Israelites as pre-Mosaic, the other as post-Mosaic. It should also be pointed out that xlix. 5-7 (which is clearly connected with the Shechem-tradition) does not favour the view that circumcision had anything to do with this early tradition. The text of this poetic passage may indeed be partly corrupt, but one thing at least is certain—it does not refer to circumcision. And, if possible, still more certain is it that the famous saying of Jacob to Joseph in xlviii. 22 (see note) does not agree with either of the narratives which Wellhausen[1] and others have sought to extract from the current text of chap. xxxiv.

It is therefore unwise in the critics to be too confident that circumcision is referred to in the true text of chap. xxxiv. A needful preliminary is to re-examine the text, and in order to do this with much profit, we must more unreservedly adopt the point of view of comparative textual criticism. Now it so happens that, according to the MT., another of the sons of Jacob—besides Simeon and Levi—is accused of having violated the moral usages of their race, viz. Reuben (xxxv. 22, xlix. 3 *f.*). The passages will be considered later, but I may venture to say here by anticipation that the results of a thorough criticism excite a suspicion that the present form of the Shechem-narratives before us[2] may be partly due to early textual corruption, *i.e.* that early redactors may have had corrupt texts to work upon, and produced rather surprising results. It is the mention of the circumcision of Shechem or the Shechemites, and all that is most closely connected with this, that I refer to here. Of course, the results of textual criticism outside Genesis must be of high subsidiary value. There are a number of passages in MT. relative to circumcision which may well be suspected of corruptness besides the passages in xxxv. 22

[1] *CH* (1889), 'Nachträge.'

[2] Assuming that J's narrative really did include the requirement of circumcision as a condition of Shechem's marriage with Dinah.

and xlix. 3 *f.*, and I venture to maintain that by a keener textual criticism a more credible text can in each case be brought to light from underneath the corruption.

The passages that I have now in my mind are—Ex. iv. 25, Josh. v. 2 *f.*, 9, Judg. xiv. 3, xv. 18, 1 S. xiv. 6, xvii. 26, 36, xviii. 25, 27, xxxi. 4, 2 S. i. 20, iii. 14, 1 Chr. x. 4, Ps. cxviii. 10, Isa. lii. 1, Jer. ix. 24 *f.*, Ezek. xxviii. 10, xxxi. 18, xxxii. 19-32, xliv. 7-9. Most of them have been treated by me elsewhere.[1] Still I may refer here (1) to Josh. v. 2, etc., where no sense can possibly be made of גבעת הערלות, whereas ג׳ הארלים, 'hill of the Arelites,' gives an excellent sense; 'Arelites' = 'Yeraḥme'elites' (cp. on 2 S. xxiii. 20). And (2) to Judg. xiv. 3, 1 S. xiv. 6, etc., where עָרֵל, עֲרֵלִים are glosses on פלשתי, פלשתים, *i.e.* 'Philistine(s)' is explained as = Arelites ([ארל]ים), which is a popular abbreviation of 'Yeraḥme'elites'[2] (ירחמאלים). Also (3) to Jer. ix. 24, where מול בערלה is incapable of a satisfactory explanation;[3] מול (as in Dt. i. 1, iii. 29, iv. 46, etc.) comes from אתמול or some other current distortion of ישמעאל or ירחמאל, and בערלה from ארבל (cp. on ארבאל, Hos. x. 14), *i.e.* ירחמאל, which was inserted as a gloss on מול or אתמול. Also (4) to Ps. cxviii. 10, where the incomprehensible אמילם ('I will circumcise them,' *i.e.* 'all nations') is certainly from ירחמאלים = ארמלים, a gloss of the utmost value for exegesis. And lastly (5) to Ezek. xxviii. 8, 10, where 'thou shalt die the deaths of those that are slain' and 'thou shalt die the deaths of the uncircumcised' admit of no clear explanation, until we see that ערלים has come from ארלים (= 'Yeraḥme'elites') and חלל from חמל = ירחמאל (so in 2 S. i. 22, 1 K. xi. 15, Ezek. xxxii. 21 *ff.*); cp. מחול, 1 K. v. 11, and בגדים חבלים, 'Ḥabulite or Ḥablite [Yeraḥme'elite] garments,' Am. ii. 8, referred to on xxv. 25.

At this point it may be well to notice that Kuenen and Cornill have already suggested what, in their respective opinions, may have been the condition on which, in the original J-narrative, Shechem's offer of marriage for Dinah

[1] See *Critica Biblica*, and cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Moses,' § 7.

[2] Cp. אריאל from ירחמאל in the much-disputed passage, 2 S. xxiii. 20.

[3] Neither N. Schmidt (*E. Bib.*, col. 2385) nor Cornill (*Das Buch Jer.*, 1905) has any real light to throw on the passage.

was accepted by her family. According to the former,[1] Jacob and his sons condone the injury done to Dinah in consideration of a heavy fine, upon which they consent to Shechem's marriage with Dinah, which would really have been accomplished if Simeon and Levi had not intervened. According to the latter,[2] the condition imposed by Simeon and Levi upon Shechem may have been the cession of a piece of ground near Shechem. That Jacob did acquire, with the due legal forms, a plot of land in this district, appears to have been an essential detail of the tradition (see xxxiii. 19, E), and accordingly the district of Shechem is prominently referred to in the early portion of the Joseph-story (xxxvii. 12 *ff.*, J).

For my part, I am certainly of opinion that some condition must have entered into the original narrative of the negotiations about Dinah. It is clear from xxiv. 3 (J) and xxviii. 1 (P) that the patriarchs had a strong objection to intermarrying with the Canaanites, and the Shechemites (or Shakramites) were Canaanites. And the condition on which that objection was waived in the case of Dinah must have been something more serious than the payment of a fine or the cession of a piece of ground. It was not, however, the undergoing of circumcision.

But it is now time to turn to textual details. Let us first of all repeat that שכם is most probably a corruption of a compound name meaning Ashḥur-ărām. This fact (as I may now venture to call it),[3] in combination with the results of the criticism of Ex. iv. 25, etc. (see above), seems to give us the key to the very 'peculiar' phrase (Dillm.)—לאיש אשר־לו ערלה (*v.* 14). Here, as often, אֲשֶׁר is mistaken for the relative אֲשֶׁר, and לו has come from the final אל in names like ירחמאל; ערלה, as in Ex. iv. 25, Jer. ix. 24, comes from some form of ירחמאל. The speech of the sons

[1] See 'Bijdragen,' vi., in *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1880, pp. 257 *ff.* (especially p. 278). The essay is included in Budde's German edition of Kuenen's *Abhandlungen*.

[2] 'Beiträge zur Pentateuchkritik,' *ZATW*, 1891, p. 13.

[3] Note that in *vv.* 20, 24, 'Shechem' appears to be distinctly called 'Asshur-Aram'; also that in Judg. vii.-ix. 'Shechem' is brought into close connexion with Yerubbaal (= Yeraḥme'el). See also on xxxiii. 18, xii. 6.

of Jacob in the original E may have been, 'We cannot do this thing, that we give our sister to a man of Asshur-Yeraḥme'el.' And it is likely that להמול (*vv.* 15, 17), נמלים (*v.* 22), and וימלו (*v.* 24) have all sprung from a misread ירחמאל, which formed part of some omitted sentence. One of the early redactors (as Wellh. has seen, there were probably two) spun the whole story out of this and analogous corruptions.

In *vv.* 20, 24, we again meet with 'Asshur-Yeraḥme'el' (or, more strictly perhaps, with 'Asshur-Aram'). שער עירם might perhaps pass in *v.* 20, but in *v.* 24 כל-יצאי שער עירו will certainly not do. The phrase there is supposed to mean 'all the citizens.' Using our experience, however (see on xxiii. 10, 18), we may confidently read כָּל-יֹעֲצֵי אֲשֹׁר יערם, *i.e.* virtually, 'all the councillors of Asshur-Yeraḥme'el.' Similarly, in *v.* 20, אל-אש׳ יערם and אל-אנשי [אשר] יערם. Cp. on xxiii. 10, xxxvi. 43. Note also החוי,[1] *i.e.* האשחרי, in *v.* 2; Ḥamor (= Yeraḥme'el) was an Ashḥurite (𝔊, 'a Ḥorite'). See on xiv. 6, xxxvi. 2, 22.

A confirmation of this view may be given. In *v.* 21 שלמים הם ו interrupts the connexion. We cannot help connecting אתנו with ישבו; this indeed is supported by Sam., 𝔊, Pesh.[2] But שלמים הם, if it means 'are peaceable,' cannot dispense with אתנו or עמנו. But is 'peaceable' a possible rendering? and how can we venture to insert a second אתנו? Above all, note that שלם in xxxiii. 18 is a corruption of ישמעאל. Surely it is so here; read certainly ישמעאלים הם, 'they were Ishmaelites,'[3] a gloss on the corrupt phrase אנשי עירם (*v.* 20). Thus *vv.* 20 *f.* (the sequel of *v.* 18) become, 'And Ḥamor came to Asshur-Aram, and spoke with the men of [Asshur]-Aram, saying, Let these men dwell with us in the land, etc.' *V.* 22 appears to be a redactional insertion, in the interest of the circumcision-theory.

Another confirmation. In the opening words of *v.* 27

[1] Ed. Meyer (p. 331) comes to the right conclusion, but with poor arguments.

[2] Geiger, Ball, and Gunkel agree.

[3] Geiger (*Urschrift*, p. 76) and Winckler (*AOF* xxi. 442) propose 'Salemites,' taking שָׁלֵם, xxxiii. 18, as the name of a city.

החללים, as Gunkel remarks, makes no sense. If the Shechemites were already slain, why do the brothers fall upon them? Gunkel would read הַחֹלִים 'the sick,' regarding this as parallel to נאבים in *v.* 25. But, as we have seen, חלל most probably comes from חמל = ירחמאל, and as for בהיותם נאבים in *v.* 25, כ' is surely a redactional substitute for בטחים (cp. Judg. viii. 11, xviii. 27), made in the interest of a theory (similarly Winckler, *AOF* xxi. 442). *Vv.* 25-27 will thus contain a statement that on the third day (*i.e.* after a short interval; see Judg. xx. 30) the sons of Jacob took their swords, and fell upon the unsuspecting Yerahme'elites, and spoiled the city. The sense is greatly improved.

What, then, is the kernel of the story? It is an episode in the Israelitish conquest of a portion of the Arabian border-land. A small Israelite clan called 'Dinah' is in danger of being absorbed by the Canaanite majority in Asshur-Aram (Shakram, Shechem), a city which was at once in the 'land of Canaan' and in Asshur-Yerahme'el, for the latter phrase was used widely, and so could include the smaller region called Canaan. Other clans (Simeon and Levi), nearly related to Dinah, seek to prevent this, and, probably at dawn, fall upon and massacre the freemen of the city. They have made good their entrance by craft, for they have given their assent, upon a specified condition, to the fusion of the two races, and no watch is kept against them. After they have fallen, the Canaanites of the neighbourhood gather their warriors, and so nearly destroy Simeon and Levi that these clans only continue to exist in scattered fragments. The latter statement is not merely an inference from *v.* 30. Chap. xlix. 5-7 (see revised text) shows that a severe vengeance—according to tradition—was taken upon the two Hebrew clans, and that the other Israelite clans recognised its justice. See further, on xlviii. 22. In justice to other views I will add that Stucken (*Astralmythen*, pp. 76, 144 with notes) compares Dinah to Helena, Simeon and Levi to the Dioscuri. This is plausible; but what follows? The mythological key only opens a few of the locks of Genesis, and I can see no sign of its doing so either here or in xlix. 5-7. Also that, according to Ed. Meyer, the 'Canaanites and Perizzites' did not combine to take

vengeance on Jacob's family (*v.* 30) or at least on Simeon and Levi; xlix., as he thinks, refers not to the remote past but to the future, *i.e.* to the writer's own period. He regards the story as the legendary reflex of the events related historically in Judg. ix. (*Die Israeliten*, pp. 419, 422).

THEOPHANIES; DEATHS OF DEBORAH AND RACHEL (GEN. XXXV.)

COMPOSITE and ill-arranged. Jacob passes on to Bethel, where he builds an altar, and gives it a name (see below). We also hear that Deborah died, and was buried; and then that Jacob had another theophany, and called the name of the place Bethel. The notice which now appears in *v.* 13, of Jacob's erection of a *maṣṣēbah*, and of his drink-offering, is no longer in its original setting. As Cornill has shown,[1] it originally came after the account of the death of Deborah; we must, however, omit the words immediately following ויצב יעקב מצבה, which are a redactional insertion.

What we have to treat of now is (1) the true form of the name which appears as El-Bethel (*v.* 7), and (2) the statement respecting Deborah (*v.* 8). (1) As to El-Bethel, the real difficulty is, not that which seems to have struck 𝔊 as such, but the absence of a proper name prefixed to the title El-Bethel. In xxxi. 13 we have had to correct MT.'s האל ביתאל into ירחמאל אל ב׳. It is not improbable that underneath למקום in *v.* 7 *a* lies the original reading לו׳ ירחמ׳. That מקום sometimes comes from ירחמ׳ (cp. יקמעם, יקים) is clear from xii. 6, etc. (see *ad loc.*). Thus we get, 'And there he built an altar, and called it Yerahme'el, God of Bethel' (cp. on xxxiii. 20).

[1] *ZATW*, 1891, pp. 16-19. So too Gunkel, p. 336.

Next, who was the person here called 'Deborah'? Was she really the nurse of Ribḳah? But is it likely that the name of a nurse should have been preserved? J, in xxiv. 59, simply speaks of 'her nurse.' And can we imagine that a nurse would have done anything that legend-makers would have deemed of importance? For, whoever the dead woman was, she must traditionally have been a somewhat conspicuous figure in her life. How strange, too, that this nurse should have been present in Jacob's train, and that the whole Jacob-tribe should have made a ceremonial mourning over her! Lastly, how comes it that the *allon*-tree was not called 'the *allon* of Deborah' (cp. Judg. iv. 5)? Can the text be correct?

The problem is a very difficult one. Let us first of all consider the name 'Allon-bākūth.' 'Tree of weeping' is obviously wrong; בכות must be an error. There would be nothing to surprise us in this; the names of sacred trees (אלה, אלון) are often corrupt (see *e.g.* on xii. 6, xiii. 18, Judg. iv. 11, ix. 37, 1 S. x. 3). Sound method seems to require that we should look for some passages which, besides referring to Bethel, contain some name or names which admit of being compared with Allon-bākūth. There are two such passages. One is Judg. ii. 1 *a*, 5 *b*, where a divine Being is said to have come up from Gilgal to Bochim (בכים[ה]), where sacrifices were offered to Yahweh. Evidently 'Bochim' is equivalent to 'Bethel,' and the form may perhaps best be accounted for as an irregular contraction of בכרים[1] (for the clan Beker, see xlvi. 21, 2 S. xx. 1). The other is 1 S. x. 3, where a spot called אלון תבור is spoken of as not far from Bethel; Luc. gives *τῆς δρυὸς τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς*, *i.e.* אלון בחור. From these we may safely gather that such a place-name as Bikrath or Bekorath (cp. 1 S. ix. 1) or Baḥūrath is to be expected near Bethel. The original name of the tree was therefore, probably, not Allon-bākūth, but Allon-Bikrath, for which an alternative form may have been Allon-Ribḳath, *i.e.* Tree of Ribḳath (Rebekah).

Next, as to Deborah. In Judg. iv. 4 *f.* we find a prophetess and 'judge' called Deborah,[2] who dwells under

[1] Cp. ברים for בכרים (2 S. xx. 14), and צאן and צען from צבעון (xxxvii. 2).

[2] On the name 'Deborah' in Judg. iv. 4, see *Crit. Bib.* p. 450.

the palm-tree (?) of Deborah, between Ramah and Bethel. That this Deborah can have no place in a patriarchal narrative is clear. It is quite possible, however, that a reference to this personage may have been interpolated by a gloss-maker into a passage which, properly speaking, referred only to Ribḳah. The difficulty arising out of מינקת is not insuperable. That the tradition really gave the name Deborah to Ribḳah's nurse is most improbable (see above); can the reading מינקת be correct? For my part, I think not. It has probably arisen by transposition of letters from יקמנת, which would be, according to analogy, a corrupt form[1] of ירחמאלית. 'Deborah (דבורה), Yeraḥme'elitess,' is possibly an alternative reading to 'Ribḳah' (רבקה). The Deborah referred to is the prophetess, who, like other prophets, was of Yeraḥme'elite origin.[2] The glossator knew this, and stated it clearly. Later on, the gloss found its way into the text; a corruptly written ירחמנית became ימנקת, and ultimately, by an ingenious and easy transposition of letters, מינקת. Deborah—the traditional heroine of another age—became the contemporary of Jacob, and the humble but honoured dependent of Jacob's mother, Ribḳah. That the statement in *v.* 8 (with which *v.* 14 must be connected) is misplaced, is obvious. The death of Ribḳah must originally have stood in some other context which is now lost. Her grave was placed at Bethel, because of the place-name Allon-Ribḳath (originally Allon-Bikrath).[3] Probably, with Winckler, we should read 'she was buried under the '*allon* in Bethel.' The libation in *v.* 14, which (apart from R's insertions) refers to Deborah's grave, is probably meant as consisting of wine, and as a refreshment for the dead. The reference to the oil was suggested to R by xxviii. 18 (Cornill).[4]

Verses 16-20 record the death of Jacob's favourite wife,

[1] Cp. יקמעם, יקנעם.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Prophet,' §§ 9, 35, 43, etc.

[3] For another view see *E. Bib.*, col., 1102, note 1; also col. 594 ('Bochim'), overlooked by Ed. Meyer (p. 273), who can even see in the name 'Deborah' a vestige of animal-worship. Against this see *Crit. Bib.* on Judg. iv. 4 *f.*

[4] Against Cornill's view of *v.* 14, see Grüneisen, *Der Ahnenkultus*, p. 128 *f.*

Rachel. *V.* 16 in the A.V. reads smoothly enough—'and there was but a little way to come to Ephrath.' The margin, however, warns us that the translators were uncertain about כברת הארץ, for it records the rendering, 'a little piece of ground.' Certainly it is, as Driver remarks, 'a peculiar expression.' According to *BDB* the word כברת means 'a distance of land, or length of way,' which is illustrated by Assyrian *kibrâti*, 'a (widely extended) territory, or quarter of the world.' From this Winckler[1] derives the supposed meaning, 'border,' 'frontier.' But how this is possible I cannot see (see Muss Arnolt's *Ass. Dict. s.v.*). The phrase כ׳ ארץ is found in 2 K. v. 19, and the two passages must be taken together. It is important to notice that the background of both stories may be, and probably is, N. Arabian,[2] and that in both passages a regional name is not impossible. What, then, is the regional name out of which כברת may have arisen? Our choice lies between בכורה (see above, on *v.* 8 *b*) and רחבות. To the latter word we have already traced the obscure regional name כפתר (see on x. 14), which is not far off from כברת. It should also be noticed (*a*) that הארץ and ארץ are little less peculiar than כברת; (*b*) that there are cases in which ארץ has probably arisen out of a misunderstood אר׳ (ארם) or ער׳ (ערב); (*c*) that in x. 11 רחבת עיר has come from ר׳ ערב, 'Arabian Rehoboth'; and (*d*) that ויהי has sometimes arisen out of והוא. The result is that ויהי עוד כב׳ האר׳ has most probably come from וְהוּא עֲרָב רְחֹבֹת עֲרָב, 'that is, Arabia; Arabian Rehoboth,' a gloss indicating the region where the place here called ביתאל lay. Omitting this, the narrative runs thus, 'And they moved camp from Bethel, in order to come to Ephrath, and Rachel,' etc.

Consistency, when it can be had, is pleasing, and certainly the redactor is consistent when he inserts, most probably as a second gloss on אפרתה, עד היום, which (see on xix. 37 *f.*) probably comes from עֲרַב יָמָן, 'Yamanite Arabia.' The first gloss is הוא בית לחם, 'that is Beth-lehem,' *i.e.*

[1] *AOF*, 3rd ser., iii. 444.

[2] On 2 K. v. see *Crit. Bib.* Cp. also *E. Bib.*, 'Naaman,' and 'Rachel's Sepulchre,' articles which pointed the way without being completely accurate.

'Beth-Yeraḥme'el.'[1] Both glosses got into the text, the one in *v.* 19 (end), the other, unfortunately, at the end of *v.* 20.

Before Rachel's death, tradition stated (*v.* 18) that she gave birth to a son variously called Ben-oni and Binyāmīn. The former is supposed to mean 'son of my sorrow' (so 𝔊); the latter, 'son of the right hand' (*i.e.* of good fortune). Cp. the Finnish epic (*Kalevala*, by Crawford, Rune l.),

> When the mother named him, Flower,
> Others named him, Son-of-sorrow.

Tradition, however, was not quite consistent; *Test. xii. Patr.* presupposes for 'Binyāmīn' the meaning, 'son of days,' *i.e.* 'of old age.'[2] A more plausible explanation is 'southern son,' a collective term for the people of the southern portion of Amurru[3] (Palestine, Phœnicia, and Cœle-Syria), or perhaps of the highland district called Ephraim.[4] For the former view, Winckler compares שׂמאל (Sam'al, at the foot of the Amanus mountains); for the latter, H. W. Hogg refers to the name צפון (Ṣāfōn), applied to a district of Gilead, and to the Edomite district תימן (Tēman). We can hardly doubt, however, that ימין is really not = the south, but a modification of יָמָן (see on xlvi. 10), and that שמאל is a corruption of ישמעאל, צפון of צבעון = ישמ׳ (see on xxxvi. 2), and תימן of יתמן = ישמ׳. Similarly, Oni in Ben-oni is a regional name; perhaps 'Oni' should rather be 'Ono' (see Neh. vi. 2, vii. 37). On, Ono, Onam, Onan are characteristically N. Arabian names; see on xxxviii. 4, xli. 45, Ex. i. 11, Josh. vii. 2, Ezek. xxx. 17, Hos. iv. 15, Neh. vi. 2. The centre of the original Benjamite district may have been called On, and certainly the leading racial element in Benjamite was Yeraḥme'elite.

As to 'Ephrathah, that is, Bethlehem' (*v.* 19), it may be added that Ephrathah may have been the district in which this Beth-Yeraḥme'el (there were other places of this name)

[1] Both 'Ephrath' and 'Beth-lehem' are primarily N. Arabian names. Other places also came to be so designated. But cp. Ed. Meyer, p. 273 (for the prevalent view).

[2] Benj. 1; see *E. Bib.*, col. 534, note 1.

[3] *KAT*(3), p. 180.

[4] *E. Bib.*, col. 534.

was situated. See also 1 Chr. ii. 19, 24, 50, iv. 4, and cp. *Crit. Bib.* p. 202, foot.

In xxxv. 21-22 *a* J reports what Gunkel calls 'Reuben's shameful deed.' Once, this scholar thinks, the narrative must have gone further. Now, it breaks off in the middle.[1] 'God forbid,' thinks the narrator, 'that I should even commit such dreadful things to writing.' Is this really so? Of course, 'and (when) Israel heard of it' requires to be followed by the words of blame which he must have uttered *if* וישמע ישראל is correct, and *if* this account of 'Reuben's shameful deed' can be depended upon. But the truth is that textual corruption and a redactor's ill-placed acuteness have combined to produce the result now before us, a result which has so shocked the moderns that they have tried to explain it away archæologically.[2]

The received text (reserving *v.* 21) needs to be corrected as follows—ויהי בשכן ישמ׳ בארץ ההוא וילך ראובן ויכבש את־בלשן [עֶרֶב ישמעאל ישראל], 'And it came to pass, when Ishmael dwelt in that land, that Reuben went and subdued Bilshan [gloss, Arabia of Israel].' Here 'Ishmael' is transferred from the end of the verse, where ישמעאל underlies וישמע, and originally stood side by side with the alternative but inferior reading, ישראל. כבש for שכב needs no defence. בלהה and פילגש have the same origin, viz. אבישן, *i.e.* Arab-Ishmael, see Ezra ii. 2 (cp. on Ex. xxxi. 2, Josh. vii. 21, and on אבישג, p. 120); for ערב see on אביך, xlix. 4. 'Bilshan' (*i.e.* Ishmaelite Arabia) was the name of a district which the tribe of Reuben conquered, very possibly under circumstances shocking to the moral sense of a later age.

Let us now turn back to *v.* 21. מהלאה למגדל-עדר is doubtless obscure, but the gloom lightens when we remember that הלאה and מהלאה almost constantly represent ירחמאל (see on xix. 9, 1 S. x. 3, etc.), and that a misunderstood אדר׳ (= אדרעי) may easily have been misread as עֵדֶר. למגדל may perhaps have come from a dittographed ירחמאל. In this case the statement simply is that 'Israel moved camp, and pitched his tent in Yerahme'el of Edrei.' At any rate,

1 𝔊, however, adds וירע בעיניו.

2 See W. R. Smith, *Kinship*[(2)], pp. 108 *ff.*; *Journ. of Phil.* ix. 86, note 2; Ulmer, *Die semit. Eigennamen*, p. 16.

'Edrei' must be right. In Dt. i. 4 (see note) and elsewhere it appears as a place of importance in 'Bashan,' a name which has come from 'Abshan,' *i.e.* 'Arab-Ishmael.' It is possible that 'Edrei' could also be described as being in 'Bilshan' (see above).

This land, we now see, was forcibly taken by Reuben (cp. Num. xxxii. 37) from the Ishmaelites or Yerahme'elites who originally dwelt there. The story may have been inserted as a parallel to that in chap. xxxiv.; possibly it is incomplete. Cp. on xlix. 3 *f.* The remainder of chap. xxxv. hardly requires any special commentary here.

GENEALOGY OF ESAU (GEN. XXXVI. 1-30)

WE have discussed the name of Esau (see on xxv. 25), also his early fortunes; we now proceed to his genealogy. *Vv.* 2, 3 give the names of his three wives. For 'Adah' see on iv. 19, and for 'Basemath,' on xxvi. 34. 'Oholibamah' has been much misunderstood. It is quite right to compare the Phœnician אהלבעל, אהלמלך, and S. Arabian אהלאל, אהלעתתר, but this, of course, does not show that the name, together with its Hebrew parallels, אהליאב, אהלה, אהליבה, אהל, has anything to do with אֹהֶל, 'tent,' though *BDB* actually gives 'tent of the high place,' and similar meanings for the parallel names. A more special inquiry into the meanings of הל and חל in combination with י, א, and מ will reveal the secret of 'Oholibamah' and the like, by which Ed. Meyer (p. 339) confesses himself baffled. The truth is that אהל in proper names, and now and then in narratives where at first sight it seems to mean 'tent' (*e.g.* iv. 20; cp. also on xiii. 12, ויאהל), is a

popular abbreviation (analogous to ארם) of ירחמאל. It is so too with הל or חל, יהל or יחל, in the proper names יהללאל, 1 Chr. iv. 16, 2 Chr. xxix. 12; אחלי, 1 Chr. ii. 31, xi. 41; חלאה, 1 Chr. iv. 5 (wife of Ashḥur); יחלאל, xlvi. 14 (see note), and the presumed adverb הלאה (see above, on xxxv. 21). במה, however, is surely impossible. Either ב should be ר, or במת (if we may read thus) has come from בשמת. From *v.* 41 it seems that the name underlying Oholibamah is a clan-name. ענה and צבעון are variants; see on *vv.* 20, 24. 'Hivite' should be 'Ḥorite' or 'Ashḥurite' (xxxiv. 2).—אליפז (Eliphaz) in *v.* 4 is familiar to us from Job (ii. 11, etc.). How shall we explain it? 'My God is pure gold' is uncritical and sounds irreligious (Job xxxi. 24). May it not have come from אליצפן (Ex. vi. 22, Num. iii. 30)? A son of Eliphaz is called צפו (*v.* 11), which is a shortened form of צפון. This name, equally with צבעון (*v.* 2, etc.), comes from שמעון = ישמעאל. Different branches of Ishmael or Yeraḥme'el may bear names which, critically viewed, have the same origin. For רעואל see on xvi. 13 (El-roi), Ex. ii. 18.—יעיש (*vv.* 5, 14) or יעוש, Ḳr. (so, too, Kt. *v.* 18), has been held to be 'the phonetical equivalent of the Ar. lion-god Yaghuth, the protector.'[1] It must, however, be grouped with יוֹעָשׁ (1 Chr. vii. 8), and probably עשן. In all these names עש may come from עשר = אשור.—יעלם is surely neither 'ibex'[2] (W. R. Sm.) nor 'he who knows,' *i.e.* the sun (Winckler). Like יעל and עלמן it comes from ישמעאל.—קרח seems to have been a widely-spread clan-name. It reminds one of קרקר, Judg. viii. 10; קרקע, Josh. xv. 3; also of בן־הרקחים (Neh. iii. 8), which doubtless comes from בן־ירחם. קרחה in Mesha's inscription (*l.* 21) may have the same origin; it was perhaps the acropolis which contained a temple of the supreme god Yeraḥme'el, also called Kemosh (= Ashḥur-Ishmael). See *Crit. Bib.* pp. 328, 358). Thus קרח is probably an expansion of a fragment of ירחם.[3]

Vv. 9-14. The sons of Esau. How, one asks, can

[1] *Journ. of Phil.* ix. 91. But cp. Lagarde, *Mitteil.* ii. 77; also Winckler, *AOF* xxi. 446.

[2] See Gray, *HPN*, p. 90, note 5. Besides, the ethnic connexion is plain.

[3] Cp. *Psalms*[(2)], vol. i. p. xlv.

Esau, in *vv.* 9, 43, become the 'father of Edom'? Elsewhere (*vv.* 1, 8, 19, cp. xxv. 30) Edom is but another name of Esau. Ulmer[1] suggests that אבי in *v.* 43 may have arisen out of הוא. Most probably, however, אבי, as so often, has come from אבר, *i.e.* עֵרֶב. In both verses there is a gloss, though only in *v.* 43 is it introduced by הוא. In *v.* 9 it is 'Arab-edom,' a gloss on 'Esau'; in *v.* 43, 'that is, Esau Arab-edom,' a gloss on 'Edom.'—In *v.* 11, תימן hardly means 'southern'; indeed, it is not clear that such an epithet would be correct (see *E. Bib.*, 'Teman'). Rather, it comes from ישמן = יתמן, *i.e.* 'Ishmael.' Cp. Jer. xlix. 7, 'Is wisdom no more in Teman'? Yerahme'el or Ishmael was famous for wisdom (1 K. iv. 31). Cp. also the suggestive name Timnath-serah, where 'Serah' certainly comes from 'Ashhur.'—אומר (like עירם, *v.* 43) comes from ירחמאל; note the remark on Yerahme'elite branches, above.—צפו. See on 'Eliphaz,' *v.* 4. But 𝔊 reads צופר (so in *v.* 15, and in 1 Chr. i. 36; cp. Job ii. 11).—געתם. Perhaps from נעמת. Cp. 'Ṣophar the Naamathite,' Job ii. 11.—קנז. See Cooke, p. 144 *f.*; כנזרמן probably from קנז רמען, Kenaz-Yerahme'el.

'Timna' (תמנע), in *v.* 12, like ימנע (*v.* 22), תמנה, and ימנה, all probably have the same origin as תימן (see on *v.* 11). See *E. Bib.*, 'Timna,' and cp. Gunkel.

Vv. 15-19. List of the chieftains (𝔊 ἡγεμόνες) of the sons of Esau. נחת (*v.* 17); perhaps from מנחת (*v.* 23). But cp. נחם.—זרח, like חרם, probably from אשחר (see on xxxviii. 30).—שמה, *i.e.* שמעה (see on 1 S. xvi. 9).—מזה (μοζε, μοζαι). Cp. זמה, 1 Chr. vi. 5, which, like זמזמים, Dt. ii. 20, comes from שמע or ישמעאל. It may, indeed, be an inferior variant to שמה. (The need of a keener criticism is very apparent in Gunkel's note.) עמלק is a popular corruption of ירחמאל; cp. Meluḫḫa = N.W. Arabia.

Vv. 20-30. Two lists of clans of Ḥorites. The latter are not cave-dwellers,[2] but Ashhurites). Dt. ii. 12, 22 (see note) contains mistaken archæology; Esau himself, as we

[1] *Die semit. Eigennamen*, i. 24, note 2.

[2] 'Cave-dwellers' would not be distinctive enough. Caves were abundant in hilly regions (cp. Macalister, *Sidelights from the Mound of Gezer* (1906). The Ḥorite names are N. Arabian.

have seen, was an Ashḥurite. Another corruption of Ashḥur is Seir.[1] How could Seir be a Ḥorite if the Ḥorites were an aboriginal race, unless, indeed, we suppose that 'Seir' first of all meant an aboriginal race, and then came to mean Esau, for certainly xxvii. 11 (see note) originally ran 'my brother is Seir'? And even apart from this, the opening names show conclusively that the list is Yeraḥme'elite. Take, first, Loṭan. The origin of Loṭ (whence Loṭan) may be uncertain (see on xi. 27), but Loṭ was certainly the kinsman of the hero of Arâb-Arâm or Arâb-Reḳem, known to us as Abraham. Next, Shobal. Robertson Smith, it is true, took this to mean 'young lion.'[2] But even if there were no other objection to this theory,[3] the occurrence of Shobal in 1 Chr. ii. 50 among distinctly Yeraḥme'elite names would be enough to prove my thesis. In fact, שובל like שבואל, 1 Chr. xxiii. 16, comes from ישמעאל. Lastly, צבעון (Ṣibeon), which Robertson Smith explained, from Arabic as usual, as 'hyæna,' is really to be grouped with ציבא, צובא [צבא[ים, זאב, and זבל, and Sin. צובו, all of which are surely corrupt fragments of ישמעאל.

It is true the MT. adds ישבי הארץ (which Gunkel renders 'die Ureinwohner'), and 𝔊 agrees, except that it reads ישב, and connects it with החרי. But with the evidence before us that ישב (like יבש and יבס) is not seldom a corruption of ישמעאל[4] (ישבעל = ישב'), we cannot feel sure that the reading of MT. is correct. Suffice it to refer to 2 S. v. 6 and 1 S. xxvii. 8. In the former passage we find היבסי יושב הארץ, and so in 1 Chr. xi. 4. Nowhere else, however, are the Jebusites so called, and if 'Jebusites' was the name specially borne by the pre-Israelite dwellers in Jerusalem, it would be incorrect to speak of them as 'the inhabitants of the land'; in Josh. xv. 63 the only right explanatory phrase is used—'the inhabitants of Jerusalem.' The best solution of this problem is that יושב has come from ישב' (*i.e.* ישבעל), which

[1] See on xxv. 25. The corruption is, of course, a very ancient one (cp. on Dt. xxxiii. 2). Rameses III., in the Harris Papyrus (Brugsch, p. 203; W. M. Müller, pp. 135 *f.*, cp. p. 240), claims to have 'destroyed the Saira among the tribes of the Shasu.' According to Müller, the Saira are the same as the Ḥorites. Cp. *E. Bib.*, col. 1182, note 2.

[2] *Journ. of Phil.* ix. 90.

[3] Cp. Gray, *HPN*, p. 109.

[4] Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Zibeon.'

was given as a variant to יבסי, and that הארץ is a redactional insertion, which arose through a misunderstanding.

In 1 S. xxvii. 8 the same problem emerges. The traditional text has כי הנה ישבות הארץ אשר מעולם, which Wellhausen, Driver, and Budde render, 'for these are the populations (cp. the prophetic ישבת) that inhabited the land.' A reference to Gen. xxv. 18, however, will show that ישבות is a corruption of ישבול[1] (*i.e.* ישמעאל), while, as 𝔊 suggests, הנה is *hinneḥ*, 'behold.' See *Crit. Bib.*

In the present passage (*v.* 20) the solution of the problem must be a similar one. ישבי must represent ישב', *i.e.* ישמעאל, which is a gloss on חרי (cp. 1 Chr. ii. 1, 'Hur,' a Calebite). הארץ, as in 2 S. v. 6, is a redactional insertion.

'Zibeon' and 'Anah' are closely connected in *vv.* 2 (25), 21, 24. ענה is obscure;[2] but cp. Ben-ana, Am. Tab. 125, 37. See on *v.* 24.—Dishon, Dishan[3] should probably be Rishon, Rishan, *i.e.* אַשֻּׁרוֹן, אַשֻּׁרָן; cp. on 'Rosh,' xlvi. 21, Ezek. xxxviii. 2 *f.*, and on 'Sirion,' Dt. iii. 9. See also *E. Bib.*, 'Dishon,' 'Uz' (middle paragraph).—אצר. Cp. שנאצר (1 Chr. iii. 18), the first part of which represents ישמן, *i.e.* ישמעאל (cp. on שנאב, xiv. 2). אצר, therefore, is a portion of the great Ishmaelite family. The name may also enter into the disputed נבוכדראצר (*Crit. Bib.* p. 395).—In *v.* 22 הימם (in Chr. הומם) should perhaps be הימן (so 𝔊, Vg. in Gen.), which may come from אחימן (*i.e.* Ashḥur-Yaman), Num. xiii. 22, etc.—In *v.* 23, for Alwan, see on xiv. 18.—מנחת, for euphony, from חמנת, *i.e.* חמן[יר] with feminine ending, like מחלת from חמל[יר]. Cp. מנוחה, Judg. xx. 43; מנחות, 1 Chr. ii. 52; and *E. Bib.*, 'Manahethites'; see also on 'Mahanaim,' xxxii. 3.—עיבל; see on Dt. xi. 29.—שפו (in Chr. שפי), like פישון (ii. 11) and שפן (2 K. xxii. 12), from ישפן (1 Chr. viii. 22), a corruption of ישמן = ישמעאל.—אונם; see on 'Ben-oni,' xxxv. 18.

We come now to the benê Ṣibeʿon (*v.* 24). איה is thought to mean 'kite'[4] (Lev. xi. 14, etc.). But thus far the supposed animal names have proved illusory. The word

[1] Note how often את and אל are confounded (*e.g.* in Judg. xix. 18).
[2] The Arabists explain 'wild ass' (W. R. Smith, p. 90).
[3] A sort of antelope, say some (*ibid.*).
[4] *Ibid.*; *E. Bib.*, 'Aiah.

(to which MT. prefixes ו) is probably imperfect. And what shall we say of the Midrash-like notice given by MT.? Shall we, with Gunkel, adhere to it, with the exception of the הימם, which baffles the utmost ingenuity? Surely not. For ענה (in *v.* 24 at any rate) we should possibly read Onan or Ainan.[1] This, however, is a trifle. The main point is that, where MT. has הימם, 𝔊 has *τὸν Ιαμειν* [Luc. *Εαμιν*], *i.e.* ימין, while Onk. presupposes האימים, which, as we have seen on xiv. 6, represents and ultimately comes from ירחמאלים. As a gloss on הימם (?הֵימָנִים), a scribe or corrector inserted את־החמרים, 'the Ḥamorites' (a branch of the Yeraḥme'elites, see on xxxiii. 19). For במדבר ברעתו read perhaps במ' בארות (cp. 'Beeroth benê Yaakan,' a wilderness station, Dt. x. 6). מצא is suspicious. Thus we get, 'this is the Anah who * the Yemanites (Ḥamorites) in the wilderness of Beeroth for his father Ṣibeon.' Some important event in the history of the N. Arabian tribes is thus briefly and inadequately reported. The form of the present text is influenced by the story in 1 S. ix. 3 *ff.*

In *v.* 25 'Oholibamah' appears as a man; 'bath 'Anah' is an incorrect gloss. Why not, indeed? Clans are sometimes personified as males, sometimes as females.—In *v.* 26 חמדן suggests a pretty problem. Nöldeke explains it as 'desirable,' from Ar. *ḥamdân* (*E. Bib.*, 'Names,' § 77). But must not the original meaning have been different? חֲמִדָן (Gray, *HPN* 64) would not be a compound with חָם, 'father-in-law,' but with a fragment of ירחם, while דן would be, not a divine title, but a tribal name.[2] The name would thus be = מחנה־דן (see footnote on xxxii. 3), and mean 'Danite Yeraḥme'el'; cp. אבידן, 'Danite Arabia' (see on Num. i. 11). But Chr. gives חמרן, which would come from רחמן, a modification of ירחמאל.—Another interesting name is אשבן, which Nöldeke[3] finds as obscure as Aḥban and Aḥiman, but which, from the new point of view, is clear enough. בן (as in prop. name בני) comes from מן, *i.e.* ימן; אש,

[1] See the 𝔊 readings in *E. Bib.*, 'Anak.' Luc. favours reading עינן for ענה throughout.

[2] Hommel, however (*AHT*, p. 322), connects the element *ḥami* with the Minæan *ḥamaya*, 'to protect.'

[3] *E. Bib.*, 'Names,' § 45.

from אֹשֶׁר ; אח and אחי from אשחור.—יתרן ; see on יתרו, Ex. iii. 1.—כרן may be from עכרן (see on Num. i. 13).—*V.* 27, בלהן ; see on בלהה, xxix. 29.—זעון perhaps = צענן (Josh. xix. 33, plur.), *i.e.* צען, which comes, through צבעון, from ישמעאל, with final ן as in זבלון.—עקן ; in Chr. יעקן. See on Num. xxxiii. 31 *f.*—*V.* 28, ערץ ; see on x. 23, where it is an Arammite or Yerahme'elite name.—אֵרָן is not 'ibex'[1] (Syr. *arnā*), but like ארכון, ארנָן, and רענן (in עֵץ ר'), probably comes from רעמן, a modification of ירחמאל. Similarly אֹרֶן in 1 Chr. ii. 25 (𝔊 *αραν, αραμ*). The theory of primitive totemism cannot rightly be supported from the names we have been treating here.

LIST OF THE KINGS OF ARAM
(GEN. XXXVI. 31-39)

IS this really a list of the kings of Edom? And does the writer really wish to impress upon us that the land of Edom had kings before any king reigned over the Israelites? The latter question must be answered first, and with a view to this the second part of *v.* 31 must be criticised. Surely it is *not* likely that he had any interest in dwelling on the earlier social development of another people. A somewhat similar notice in Num. xiii. 22, where Ḥebron is, according to most, made inferior in antiquity to the Egyptian Zoan, will prove, on a closer inspection, to say something altogether different.[2] More-

[1] W. R. Smith, *Journ. of Phil.* ix. 90; Nöldeke, *E. Bib.*, 'Names,' § 68.

[2] Is the text as it stands at all natural? How does it help the comprehension of the narrative? What we expect is surely a topographical, not an archæological, indication.

over, from a grammatical point of view, לבני ישר׳ must be incorrect; to give the sense required לבני should be על-בני. 𝔊, in fact, virtually reads בישראל or בירושלם, which, however, is purely arbitrary. Nor is there any real gain to be derived from M. Bruston's conjecture (1892), that the reference is to the Israelitish conquest of Edom; for this practically requires us to insert בה, 'therein,' or עליה, 'over it.' Experience of textual corruption, however, suggests a better remedy for the faults of the text. It shows that לפני may, as in Ps. lxxii. 5, lxxx. 3, have been miswritten for לבני, and ישראל, as in 1 S. xvii. 25, Zech. xii. 1, and elsewhere, for ישמעאל; also, that the second מלך may be a dittograph. Accepting these possibilities as probabilities, we get this sense, 'with reference to the sons of Melek, with reference to the sons of Ishmael.' Thus the second part of *v.* 31 is made up of alternative glosses, stating that the list of kings has reference to the sons of Melek, or, if we prefer this clearer statement, to the sons of Ishmael. 'Melek,' as we know from the phrases עמק [ה]מלך (xiv. 17), בן [ה]מלך (Jer. xxxvi. 26), זרע המלך (1 K. xi. 14), is a popular symbol—perhaps more correctly read מלח (cp. on xiv. 3)—for ירחמאל; 'Yerahme'el' and 'Ishmael' are, in fact, equivalent. And now we can answer the first of our two questions. The list is really a list (no longer complete in all its details) of the kings of the southern Aram; אדום should most probably, as in Num. xx. 14, Judg. v. 4, 1 S. xiv. 47, 1 K. xi. 14, 16, 2 K. iii. 8 *f.*, xiv. 7, rather be אֲרָם.

The kings, according to Frazer (*Adonis*, p. 11, note 3), 'were men of other families who succeeded to the throne by marrying the hereditary princesses,' the blood royal being traced in the female line. But is it not a nearer-lying explanation that the kings arose (as in the cases of Abimelech and perhaps Saul) out of tribal chieftains? Observe the care taken to specify the district or city of each king (except the seventh, Baal-hanan, see below), which reminds us of the similar notices respecting the Israelite 'judges.' The first in order is *Bela*, son of Beor, whose city is called Dinhabah (*v.* 32), and whom Nöldeke[1] long ago identified

[1] *Untersuchungen*, p. 87; cp. Hommel, p. 153. Marquart, *Fund.* p. 11; Cheyne, *E. Bib.*, 'Bela'; Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, pp. 376 *ff.*

with the great diviner Bil'am ben Beor (Num. xxii. 5). If, as I have sought to show (on 'Pathrusim,' x. 14, and on xxiv. 10), 'Pethor,' *i.e.* Pathros,[1] Ḳedem, *i.e.* Reḳem, and Aram-naharaim are N. Arabian regional names, there are no documentary reasons for not holding that the Edomite or rather Arammite king Bela is the same as the great diviner Bil'am; for בלעם is simply a fuller form of בלע. At the same time, we cannot regard this as certain; for בלע is nothing but a clan-name produced out of a fragment of ירחמאל or of its synonym ישמעאל. We find it again in xlvi. 21 (and parallels) and 1 Chr. v. 8; cp. עלב in עלבון, 2 S. xxiii. 31, and the name בעל, 1 Chr. v. 5, viii. 30. In xiv. 2 it is the name of a N. Arabian town. Ed. Meyer warns against using these notices, but, as it seems to me, does not understand them (p. 376). בעור, too, is worth investigating. Probably it comes from ערב־עשור (written בעור), *i.e.* Arabia of 'Asshur' (see on 'Bir'sha,' xiv. 2), so that it is the name of a district, not of an individual. The city-name דנהבה has been variously identified; see *E. Bib.*, 'Dinhabah,' and Tomkins, *PEFQ St.*, Oct. 1891, pp. 322 *f.* More probably, however, it is a corruption of דיזהב (Dt. i. 1), where זהב at any rate has probably come from צבעון = ישמעאל (see on *v.* 39).

The second (*v.* 33) is *Yobab* (see on x. 29), a Zeraḥite (*i.e.* Ashḥurite, see on xxxviii. 30), whose city was Boṣrah. The place-name occurs in the little oracle, attributed (rightly ?) to Amos (Am. i. 11 *f.*), which the text makes out to refer to Edom, but which probably refers really to Aram, because in *v.* 12, for the mysterious[2] ושחת רחמיו, we should most probably read הוא אשחר ירחמאל, 'that is, Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el,' a gloss on אֶדֶם.—The third, *Hūshām* (חשם). Again we are warned against comparing חשים, xlvi. 23, Num. xxvi. 42, also 1 Chr. vii. 12, viii. 8, 11. Investigation, however, would not be unfruitful; *e.g.* in 1 Chr. vii. 12 ח׳ is

[1] In Num. *l.c.* הנהר may quite well (*pace* Meyer) mean one of the traditional streams of the border-land (see on xv. 18), and עמולקראלו may be a combination of two corrupt forms of ירחמאל. I assume that the reader has registered frequently recurring types of textual corruption.

[2] Harper's summary of explanations is very striking. A new and effectual method of textual criticism can alone dispel the mystery.

one of the *benê Aḥer* (Aḥer = Ashḥur). Ḥūshām came from the land of the Temanites. The exact situation of 'Teman' is admittedly uncertain,[1] but we can hardly be wrong in tracing תימן to יתמן = ישמעאל (see on *v.* 11). Perhaps this is the כושן עשתרים (so we should read), a king of Aram-naharaim(?),[2] in Judg. iii. 10.—The fourth, *Hadad* (הֲדַד). Properly a divine name (see pp. 33, 56). His father is called בְּדַד; 𝔊 Βαραδ (cp. on the place-name ברד, xvi. 14; ברד in 1 Chr. vii. 20 is a personal name). בדד or ברד comes from Bir-dadda, a N. Arabian name (*KAT*(2), p. 148, *l.* 6). Cp. on בן־הדד, 1 K. xv. 18, and on the defeat of Midian, Ed. Meyer, pp. 381 *f.*; Winckler, *GI* i. 49 *f.*, 193 *f.* The royal city is עוית, but 𝔊 has γεθθα[ι]μ, *i.e.* עתים. Probably we should read עשתרים (cp. above, on Ḥūshām). If so, Marquart is right in supposing that the closing words of *v.* 35 belong rather to *v.* 34. He is of opinion that 'rishathayim' in 'Cushan-rish,' Judg. iii. 8, should rather be *rōsh 'attaim*,' chief of 'Attaim.' But 'Attaim' is no name.—The fifth, *Samlah*; or rather Salmah (שַׂלְמָה), a N. Arabian ethnic. His city is משרקה; probably from רמשק (see on xv. 2).—The sixth, *Sha'ūl*, plainly N. Arabian (see on 1 S. i. 20). His city is רחבות הנהר. There must have been several Rehoboths (cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Rehoboth'). The נהר (*pace* Ed. Meyer)[3] should be one of the N. Arabian streams, of which we only know from passages like xv. 18.

The seventh is *Baal-ḥanan*, where 'Baal' is not primarily a divine title, but a popular corruption of 'Yeraḥme'el' or 'Ishmael.' Ḥanan (Ezra ii. 46 and parallels) is a clan-name of the Nethinim[4] or Ethanites; in Chr. xi. 43 it is

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Teman.'

[2] Marquart (*Fund.* p. 11) identifies these two names, though he has a peculiar theory of his own for the 'rishathayim' of Judges. Ed. Meyer (p. 374) naïvely remarks, How can an Aramæan king from the Euphrates have made a raid into the far south? *From the Euphrates!*

[3] This scholar supposes that the phrase 'the river' in the O.T., when by itself, is 'always the Euphrates.'

[4] See *Amer. Journ. of Theol.* July 1901, and cp. קוסנתן in Euting's *Nabat. Inschr.* No. 12, *l.* 1 (quoted by W. R. Smith); also Natan-iau in the second Gezer tablet (= Yonathan). The various elements in these names are all primarily N. Arabian ethnics.

the name of one of David's heroes, a 'son of Maacah,' *i.e.* presumably[1] a native of the southern Maacah. In the parallel Phœnician names too (see *E. Bib.*, 'Baal-hanan'), Ḥanan or Ḥanun was originally a clan-name (brought from Arabia). This seventh king is called a son of עכבור, a word which Robertson Smith[2] identifies with עכבר, *i.e.* the male jerboa (Ar. *ʿakbar*). But surely the mouse-clan is as imaginary as the rock-badger clan (Shaphan), the flea-clan (Parʿosh), and, one may add, the 'ascent of the scorpions' (Akrabbim). Experience assures us that both Achbor and Akrabbim are corruptions of some compound clan-name, and we may well widen the group by adding the enigmatical Achshaph and Achzib. To make a long matter short, עקרבים is nearer to the original form than עכבור; the original form is given almost correctly in a Punic inscription discovered at Carthage in 1898, and is עקברם (the inscription has כ for ק), *i.e.* ʿAkab-ram. In treating of יעקב (xxxii. 28) we have already noticed forms like עקב, which is to be regarded as a clan-name.[3] The second element רם (as in Baal-ram) represents Aram (= Yerahme'el). The name of Baal-hanan's city is not given; the text may be in disorder.[4] —The eighth, *Hadar*, or rather, probably, Hadad (II.). His city is called פעו, or rather פעור (𝔊, Ball), which may be only a variation of בעור, which may be the name both of a place and (see on *v.* 32) of a district. His wife's name, מהיטבאל, occurs in Neh. vi. 10 as a man's name. What did it originally mean? Certainly not 'El is a benefactor'; that is due to the redactors. We may take a hint from מהללאל, which is also both an early and a late name (Gen. v. 12, Neh. xi. 4), and has grown out of ירחמאל. So מהיטבאל contains one element (יטבאל) which can have come quite regularly from יתבאל = ישמעאל (cp. אתבעל, 1 K. xvi. 31). But what shall we say of מהי? Is it not recalcitrant? By no means; experience suggests an explanation. The

[1] 'Presumably,' because, as has been shown (by Winckler and by the present writer), David was of Arabian origin.

[2] *Journ. of Phil.* ix. 96; *Kinship*(2), p. 235, note 1. Johns (*Deeds*, iii. 221) compares Ass. Ugbaru.

[3] So Akshaph = ʿAkshaph = ʿAkab-shaphan, and Akzib = ʿAkzib = ʿAkab-zĕēb, and both names = Jacob-Ishmael.

[4] See Marquart's rather complicated hypothesis (*Fund.* p. 10).

genealogies in Nehemiah (iii. 4, x. 22, xi. 24) contain a name which is even more parallel than מהללאל. It is משיזבאל. Resisting an obvious but unsuitable interpretation of this name,[1] and remembering that מש and שמ are frequently corrupt fragments of שמע = ישמעאל, I suggest that the form 'משיז may have arisen out of two competing readings, viz. ישמעאל and יזבאל (see on איזבל, 'Jezebel,' p. 46), and similarly that מהיטבאל has arisen out of the two rival readings ירחמאל and יתבאל (מה having come from מח = חם, cp. on ix. 18). Whichever of the two latter we prefer, the result is the same. The wife of Hadad II. is marked out by her name as a N. Arabian woman.

She is further represented as בַּת מַטְרֵד and בַּת מֵי זָהָב. The impossible מטרד (Winckler and Ed. Meyer, in all seriousness, מטר אֵד, 'rain of mist'!) can now, I hope, receive a natural explanation. ד is really a dittographed ר, and מטר is = מטרי, a gentilic in 1 S. x. 21, which points to a N. Arabian origin. Cp. on 'Mithredath,' Ezra i. 8. Similarly מי זהב ('gold-water'!) represents מישמעאל. For other cases of זהב = 'ישמ see on ii. 11 *f.*, Dt. i. 1, 2 S. xii. 30. Similar corruptions are זאב (Judg. vii. 25), ציבא (2 S. ix. 2), צבעון (xxxvi. 2, etc.). בת is a scribe's error; perhaps the archetype had בן (so 𝔊), miswritten for מִן.

For בשמותם (*v.* 40) see on xxv. 13, and for *v.* 43 *b*, on *v.* 9. 'Pinon'; see on 'Punon,' Num. xxxiii. 42 *f.* 'Iram' (עירם), from some form of ירחמאל (cp. קרית יערים). See, further, on ער, xxxviii. 6.

[1] Cp. the Ass. Mušezib-Marduk, Mušezib-Nabu, Ṣalm-mušezib. Such an explanation may suit the Aram. name צלמשוב ('Salm delivers'), but would be inconsistent with the names with which Meshezabel is grouped, viz. (1) Meshullam and Berechiah, (2) Zadok and Jaddua, (3) Pethahiah and Zerah. The redactor imposed a fancy meaning on a corrupted form.

EARLY STORIES OF JOSEPH (GEN. XXXVII.)

THERE are special peculiarities in the cycle of Joseph-legends which at this point require to be mentioned. It may be assumed that Joseph 'was an old name for all the tribes that settled in Ephraim,' and that Joseph and Ephraim 'are simply two names, older and younger, tribal and geographical, for the same thing.'[1] The geographical name is Ephraim, which is probably (see on xli. 52) a variation of 'Arab-Yaman (Yamanite Arabia). But Ephraim is also a tribal name, and as such it must be later than Joseph. More and more Joseph may have extended its reference, so as to include a confederation of tribes, the centre of which was at Shak-ram, a name which very early became shortened into Shechem (Shekem). Winckler, I know, takes a partly different view. According to him, Joseph is a personification of the northern kingdom just as Israel is the representative of 'the united David-kingdom of the twelve tribes,' which does not prevent him from being at the same time a hero who derives his chief characteristics from Tamûz and from the sun-god (*GI* ii. 68 *ff.*). That Joseph was originally the personification of a tribal confederation, I do not see my way to admit, but I fully grant that mythic elements have attached themselves to him (see below). These elements, however, have developed into stories of a novelistic character, and in this form have become attached to the figure of Joseph. As a tribal hero, the materials for a biography were slender indeed. There was, it is true (1) the tradition of the partiality with which his father Jacob treated him, and which excited the envy

[1] H. W. Hogg, *E. Bib.*, col. 2583.

of his brothers; (2) his possession of Shechem (xlviii. 22, cp. on xxxiii. 18-20); and (3) his slavery in Miṣrim, which issued in good both for himself and for his brethren. But the element which can be plausibly referred to popular tradition is but small, and the chief object of the narrators really seems to be to provide their people with an ideal figure, worthy of equal love and reverence, and to inculcate a belief in divine providence. It has been well remarked that, full of devoutness as the narrators are, they nowhere introduce Yahweh in person, or as represented by a divine being, as acting in Joseph's behalf. See further, Gunkel, *Gen.*[2] pp. 349-353; Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, pp. 287-293; and on the name יוסף, see above, on xxx. 23, 24.

I now proceed to consider some questions which at once arise from the traditional text. The first have to do with the character of Joseph, and his relations to his brothers and to his father; and the next, to the geography of this opening scene of our highly dramatic story. Did Joseph really tell tales about his brothers to his father, whose favourite he knew that he was?

The difficult words are דִּבָּתָם רָעָה (*v.* 2), 'a bad report about them, an evil one' (?). Evidently רָעָה is wrong; but is דב' right? Joseph is a popular hero; how could he have been represented as a tale-teller? Gunkel, indeed, supposes that he told the tales because he was indignant at the wickedness of the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah. But the sequel does not favour this supposition, the basis of which is a rather poor conjecture that נַעַר אֶת־ should be נֶעֱר עַל. נֶעֱר is not a natural word to express what Gunkel thinks of; such superficial emendations rarely answer. But the only satisfactory answer to make to a critic is to try for a better solution of his problem. In order to do this, I must go back to בַּצֹּאן. Why the preposition? בשכם in xxxvii. 13 suggests that צאן is miswritten for some place-name, and in fact, in the two parallel cases, 1 S. xvi. 11 and xvii. 34, it has already been suggested to read בישמעאל; בצבען (= בישמ') would, however, be sufficient, צאן and צען being often corruptions of צבען, just as שאן and שן are of שמען or שמען. The next words, והוא נער את־, as Gunkel has seen, make

no sense.[1] But it should be remembered that ענר in xiv. 13 has come from שנער, *i.e.* ישמן עֶרֶב = שן ער׳; it is only natural to explain נער in the same way. Thus we get the gloss, ורהוא ישמ׳ ערב, 'that is, Ishmael of Arabia.' The Ishmaelite or Yerahme'elite race was widely dispersed; the glossator will have no uncertainty about his author's meaning. He knows that the scene of the story is laid in Arabia. As to את־בני בלהה וגו׳ and the troublesome רעה, both are late glosses, the latter on the difficult word דבתם. This last word still awaits correction. *BDB* explains, 'a (true) report of evil doings'; such a highly condensed phrase is scarcely tolerable. But the remedy lies close at hand. A ב has fallen out (cp. ברים, 2 S. xx. 14, for בכרים); so that the right word is ברכתם, 'their present' (cp. xxxiii. 11). The function of the youthful Joseph was to go between his father and his brethren, as the bearer of salutations and presents. How simple and natural (see 1 S. xvii. 17 *f.*)!

Next, what was the great object and occasion of the envy of Joseph's brethren (*v.* 3)? 𝔊 and Vg. here, Pesh. in 2 S., and E.V. here and in 2 S., give 'a coat (*χιτών*, *tunica*) of [many] colours.' This is certainly more plausible than the rival rendering 'a coat (tunic) of the extremities'; but how can it be critically justified? The explanation suggested by such analogies as אדרת שנער (Josh. vii. 21; cp. on בגדי שש, xli. 42) is that פסים, in כתנת פ׳, is a contraction of פתרסים ('Pathrusim'), which we have already seen (on x. 14) to be a corruption of צרפתים. From Ezek. xxvii. 7 (cp. on xli. 42) we learn that 'fine linen' (שֵׁשׁ) was one of the productions of Miṣrim, and Pathrusim is represented in x. 14 as one of the sons of Miṣrim. Probably, therefore, the 'tunic of Passim' was made of fine linen. From 2 S. xiii. 18 *f.* (critically examined) we learn that this garment was worn by princesses of Israel in their maiden years, and a gloss in that passage states that פסים was equivalent to ירחמאל (miswritten מעילים). Joseph therefore—as I understand the passage—was clad in a tunic of fine linen, as if

[1] Winckler (*AOF*, *l.c.*) renders, 'in fact, he was as a servant,' etc., and finds a mythological meaning. Joseph plays the part of the younger deities Marduk and Nebo over against the ten older gods. But הוא introduces a gloss.

he were a king's child, and not intended for the rough pastoral life. It was this which stirred the angry feelings of his brothers, and had such strangely romantic consequences.

Nor can one avoid raising a question as to the contents of Joseph's second dream. What can be the meaning of 'the sun, the moon, and eleven stars' (*v.* 9 *b*)? Most scholars regard this as a symbolical expression for Jacob, Rachel ('the unforgotten and un-lost,' Del.), and the eleven brethren, and some find here a confirmation of the supposed actual character of the patriarchs, and of the connexion of the 'twelve tribes' with the signs of the zodiac.[1] The difficulty on this view is fourfold. 1. The moon is never feminine in Hebrew. 2. A wife has nothing to do with homage to a ruler. 3. We should have expected both Jacob's wives to be referred to; and if only one, then certainly not Rachel, who was dead. 4. We are not told what symbolical form Joseph assumed in the dream (contrast *v.* 7).

This is how Winckler meets these difficulties.[2] He supposes that the reference to the moon in *v.* 10 *b* is a later insertion, that originally the moon was interpreted of Jacob, and Joseph represented as the sun-god, so that the original form of the statement in *v.* 9 *b* would be, 'and behold, the moon and eleven stars bowed down to me.' Only eleven stars, because each month one of the signs of the zodiac comes into contact with the sun, and is, as it were, absorbed by it.[3]

I cannot, however, see my way to accept these suggestions. I have no prejudice against admitting the existence of mythological elements in Biblical narratives. But I cannot think it likely that the actually existing tribes of Israel (which can never have been really twelve in number) claimed a connexion with the zodiac deities, nor can I attach any weight to the argument of some mythologists (*e.g.* Zimmern

[1] See Winckler, *GI* ii. 70 *f.*; Zimmern, *KAT*[3], p. 628; Gunkel, *Genesis*[2], p. 356, cp. p. 293; A. Jeremias, *ATAO*, p. 240; and on the other side König, *Altorientalische Weltanschauung*, etc., pp. 54 *f.*

[2] *GI* ii. 70; cp. pp. 62 *f.* See also A. Jeremias, *ATAO*, p. 240; cp. p. 53, note 3.

[3] This is one possible explanation of the number eleven in the myth of the making of the eleven monsters (Creation Epic, 1st Tablet).

and Stucken), derived from the faulty text of the 'Blessing of Jacob' in Gen. xlix.

With regard to the supposed interpolation of ואמך ('and thy mother') in *v.* 10 *b*, I would point out that in *v.* 10 *a* the interpolator (perhaps R) of the words, 'and he told it to his father and to his brothers,' has deliberately passed over Rachel. How, indeed, could an interpolator have forgotten that Joseph's mother was dead? And with regard to Joseph's being represented as the sun-god, may he not much more naturally be identified with the twelfth star? For evidently he corresponds to some extent in our story to the god Marduk, whose sacred number was eleven,[1] indicating that he was the leader of the remaining eleven constellations.

But the Babylonian god Marduk is something more than the leader of the eleven 'stars.' He is also the sun-god, who dies in winter and sinks into the underworld, and rises again on the return of spring.[2] And regarded thus, he has such a close resemblance to Tamûz (see *E. Bib.*, 'Tammuz') —who indeed is also reckoned as a son of Ea—that we cannot be surprised if Joseph, who corresponds (as we are bound to admit) to Marduk, is represented at a later point in the story as if he were a reflection of Tamûz.

These statements, it is true, assume that the Babylonian myth of the death of Tamûz-Marduk, due (as it appears) to a wild boar,[3] had penetrated into N. Arabia, and so become naturalised among the Israelites. They also involve the further assumption that the Arabian and Israelitish priesthoods had adapted the myth to pre-existent beliefs. The N. Arabian deity parallel to Marduk was the god called Ishmael or Yerahme'el, who in Israel came to be regarded as the beneficent guide and protector of the people.[4] It was a human manifestation of this deity which died and rose again,[5] and for which, under the names of Hadad and

[1] Zimmern, *KAT*[3], p. 374. It is an archæological error to represent the number eleven in *v.* 9 as a redactional ornament (C. Niebuhr, *Gesch. der Ebr. Zeitalters*, i. 169, note 1).

[2] See Zimmern, *KAT*, p. 371.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 398.

[4] See on xvi. 11 (p. 279).

[5] See *Bible Problems*, pp. 113, 128, 252 *ff.*

Ramman (Zech. xii. 11), and perhaps also Naaman, there was an annual lamentation in the spot consecrated by his memory. These things I have already (see pp. 56 *f.*) ventured to assume, trusting in the willingness of the reader to put aside prejudice and adopt a new point of view.

It was certainly a great honour which some early narrator (a priest of the tribe of Joseph?) conferred on the eponym of the Josephites when he enriched the fundamental tribal legend with details from the story of Tamûz-Marduk or Adonis. It may be useful at this point to sum up the details which seem to commend themselves most to a critical judgment.[1] 1. The astral-mythological dream (*v.* 9), just now explained. 2. The story of Joseph in the 'pit' (*vv.* 22 *ff.*), which may be suggested by the mythological statement that Adonis went down into the 'pit.' בור, 'pit,' 'cistern,' is often = Sheól.[2] 3. The dipping of Joseph's tunic in blood (*v.* 31), and the cry of the horror-stricken Jacob that 'a wild beast has devoured him' (*v.* 33; cp. *v.* 20). 4. The mourning of Jacob (*v.* 34), which was evidently an important element of the tradition and reminds us of the yearly *bikîtu*, or weeping, for Tamûz. 5. The exultant exclamation of the aged father, 'my son Joseph lives' (xlv. 28), which may remind us of the joyous cries of the votaries of Adonis on his resurrection. And 6. the intuitive wisdom and impartial beneficence of the rule of Joseph, which correspond to the same qualities in the god Marduk.

I now pass on to the geographical details, with the view of showing how these are affected by a textual criticism which does not disdain to take notice of the N. Arabian theory. It has been pointed out already (see on xii. 6, xxxiii. 18) that Shechem (Shekem)—referred to in *vv.* 12 *ff.*—is = Shakram, *i.e.* Ashḥur-Aram, while Ḥebron (*v.* 14) is possibly[3] connected with Rĕhōb (see on xxiii. 2). If so, the *'ēmeḳ* of Ḥebron is presumably the *'ēmeḳ* that belongs

[1] Cp. Winckler, *GI* ii. 75-77; Jeremias, *ATAO*, pp. 239 *f.*, and *BNT*, p. 40.

[2] See Gunkel, *Schöpfung*, p. 132, note 8.

[3] 'Possibly,' because some other account of 'Ḥebron' may be preferred. The theory given above is only a specimen of possible explanations. See on xxiii. 2.

to Beth-reḥob[1] (Judg. xviii. 28). It is doubtless surprising that if Jacob dwelt near Beth-reḥob (or Reḥōbōn) he should have sent his idolised younger son on so long a journey alone, and, perhaps one may add, that the brethren of Joseph should have moved with their flocks so far away from their father. But to omit מעמק ח׳, with Steuernagel and Gunkel, seems arbitrary. Perhaps we may suppose that different views have been combined.[2] According to one, Jacob dwelt near Shechem, and his sons were with the flocks at no great distance off. According to another, based on the tradition in xxxv. 27, Jacob and his two younger sons were at Ḥebron or Reḥōbōn. Further, that there were at least two views respecting the relations of Jacob and his sons to Shechem. According to one, both parties were on perfectly friendly terms; according to another, Simeon and Levi had brought the guilt of bloodshed upon their family, which was liable at any moment to be called to account. These different traditions could not be altogether harmonised. But it is at any rate plausible that the distance between Reḥōbōn and Shakram was not so great as that between the best-known Reḥōbōn or Ḥebron from the most familiar Shechem.

Next, as to *Dothan* (*v.* 17). Whatever may be said of the Israelitish caravan from Gilead (see below), it is certain that E's 'Midianites,' taken in connexion with the 'cistern in the desert' (*v.* 22), points to the extreme south. It is true that 2 K. vi. 13, 19 (see *Crit. Bib.*) suggests that the Dothan of the Elisha-story was not far from שמרון, and Judith iii. 9, iv. 6 that the Dothan of the Judith-story was near Yizreel. But there are reasons for thinking that the scene of both stories was originally laid in the N. Arabian border-land, and it is quite possible that there was a southern Dothan as well as a southern Shimron and Yizreel. According to Judith iii. 9 *f.*, Dothæa (*i.e.* Dothan) was near Scythopolis, *i.e.* עיר סכות,[3] which suggests the question

[1] Unless we suppose that עמק, both in xxxvii. 14 and in Judg. xviii. 28, has come from מעכת. Cp. on Ps. lx. 8.

[2] Gunkel has already suggested this.

[3] סכות, or rather סכת, is probably a contraction of סלכת (see on xxxiii. 17).

whether דנה, which occurs after שוכה in Josh. xv. 48 *f.*, may not be a corruption of דתן, *i.e.* Dothan.

In *v.* 25 we meet with the name מצרים for the first time in the Joseph-story. The presumption is very strong that this word means the N. Arabian Muṣri, but the *pros* and *cons* will be carefully put before the reader. Let us remember that in Gen. x. 6 Miṣrim appears as a son of Ḥam, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el, and that the references to the dwelling of Joseph and of the Israelites in מצרים in the Psalter can be quite well understood on the N. Arabian theory. Indeed, in Ps. lxxviii. 45 'the field of Ṣib'eon' (= Ishmael) makes a better parallelism with 'Miṣrim' than we get on the supposition that מצרים means 'Egypt' and צען 'Tanis,' while 'the land of Ḥam' in cv. 23, 27, cvi. 22, is scarcely intelligible, unless 'Ḥam' is = 'Yeraḥme'el,' and in cv. 17 to say that Joseph 'was sold for a slave' is vastly inferior to the statement that he 'was sold to the Arabians.' If so, the tradition persisted long.

The statement in *v.* 25 is that when Joseph's heartless brethren looked up from their meal they saw a caravan of merchants conveying gum tragacanth, mastic, and ladanum to Miṣrim. These very things are reckoned by Jacob among the 'fruits of the land' (xliii. 11). Here, however (according to E), the Ishmaelite merchants come from Gilead, which may quite well refer to a southern Gilead (cp. on xxxi. 47). It is equally noteworthy that in *v.* 28 *a* (cp. *v.* 36) the merchants are called Midianites[1] or (*v.* 36) Medanites. What this involves, we have seen already. We may also note that the Midianites were in a large sense Ishmaelites (see on xxv. 7). With equal truth they might be called 'Yeraḥme'elites,' and we may hold that an early gloss on the original text actually gave them this name; *i.e.* גמלים most probably came from חמלים, a short form (cp. on חללים, xxxiv. 27) of ירחמאלים, to which is prefixed the explanatory Waw, thus producing the note, 'that is, Yeraḥme'elites.' Parallels to this change occur in xii. 16, Judg.

[1] We need not, with Hommel and Jeremias, suppose a confusion between Midianites and Minæans. Nor does this passage suggest to us that 'Midian' was the ethnic name for the people of the land of Muṣri, as Winckler supposes (*KAT*, p. 143).

vi. 5, viii. 21, 26, Ezra ii. 67. I do not, of course, dream of denying that there was a demand for fragrant resins in Egypt. But it must surely be admitted that they would also be wanted in the land of Miṣrim, and Jer. viii. 22, xlvi. 11 (see *Crit. Bib.*), when closely examined, seem to point in this direction.

And now Joseph's time in Miṣrim begins. According to J, he was bought by an unnamed Miṣrite; according to E, by a court-officer named פוטיפר. The same name is given by J in xli. 45 (cp. xlvi. 20) to the priest of On who became Joseph's father-in-law. It is true that in this form the second part of the name is פרע; but the omission of ע in xxxvii. 36 and xxxix. 1 is not surprising, if we consider the variations in parallel texts elsewhere in the O.T.[1] It has been held by recent critics—and I formerly took this view myself—that, the background of the story being Egyptian, and forms like Poti-phera' (Πετεφρη)—'he whom Re (Ra) has given'—being frequent in Egyptian only after 700 B.C., we gain thereby a valuable evidence for the date of the story.[2] The evidence, however, for the Egyptian background of the original story is precisely that which is becoming doubtful, and the fact that the other supposed Egyptian names in the story (Asenath, Ṣaphenath-pa'neaḥ) cannot be as plausibly explained should suggest the necessity of caution in supporting this view, which is by no means an old and thoroughly seasoned hypothesis.[3] In the light of our previous experience of names, we shall suspect Poti-phera' 'to be a combination of two very possibly corrupt place-names or clan-names. Can we recover the original form of these names? פוט, certainly, is intelligible enough; the original which it represents is פרת, *i.e.* אפרת (see on x. 6). And the key to פרע is furnished by xvi. 12 and Hos. viii. 9, where פרא may with much probability be

[1] 𝔊 treats the names as identical.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, cols. 2588 *f.*, 3814 *f.* For the Egyptological theories see *E. Bib.*, 'Potiphar'; also Heyes, *Bibel und Aeg.* pp. 105-112. Erman (see Gunkel, p. 361) finds the ו in פוטי inexplicable at present The examples of Egyptian Aram. names compounded with פט (see S. A. Cook, *Aram. Gloss.* p. 97) do not help us.

[3] See Naville (*PSBA* xxv. 160 *f.*), who finds a name with two articles 'rather strange.'

viewed as a corruption of עֶרֶב. If so, the name of the court-officer referred to was equivalent to Ephrath-ʿarâb, *i.e.* Arabian Ephrath. All, therefore, that E could tell or imagine about this personage was that he held a certain office and that he was a Puṭite, or Ephrathite of Arabia. See further, on 'Puṭiel,' Ex. vi. 25.

And what was Potiphar's office? At first sight we seem to have a twofold account, and we are reminded of the elaborateness with which Egyptian dignitaries describe their offices and functions. The first of his titles is סרים פרעה, and the commentators discuss the question whether סרים here means 'eunuch' or 'high officer.'[1] It should be noticed, however, that whereas in xl. 2 (E) the chief butler and the chief baker are called סריסים, the שר הטבחים (Potiphar) is not called סרים in xl. 3 (E). The question now arises whether סרים פרעה in xxxvii. 36 is rightly read. It is quite possible that סרים may be a corruption of אשור. We have an example of this in 2 K. xviii. 17, where רב־סרים has probably come from עֶרֶב אֲשׁוּר (see *Crit. Bib.*); cp. סיסרא, Judg. iv. 2, Ezra ii. 53, etc., and סוס and סוסים often (*e.g.* Judg. v. 22, 1 K. x. 25), for אשור, ים—. Very possible, too, that [ה]פרע may have arisen in the same way as פרע in פוטי פ׳. And taking a wider view of the state of the text, and of the nature of the textual corruptions and glosses, must we not say that these possibilities are also probabilities, and that instead of 'eunuch of Pharaoh' we should recognise, as a gloss on Poti-phera', another compound name, Asshur-ʿarâb. This should not be taken to imply that Joseph's master was not a Miṣrite. That Miṣrim was considered an Asshurite region appears from Ezek. xxxi. 3.[2]

But, if not a eunuch, what was the important personage who became Joseph's master? The text replies that he was שַׂר [הַ]טַּבָּחִים. It is a natural conjecture that this phrase, here and in 2 K. xxv. 8 *ff.*, Jer. xxxix. 9 *ff.*, lii. 12 *ff.*, means 'captain of the bodyguard,' an office in the Egyptian court which in the Ptolemæan age was expressed

[1] Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Eunuch.'

[2] That the name Ashḥur or Asshur sometimes means a larger, sometimes a smaller region, need not surprise us. Cp. on x. 11.

by the term *ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ*,[1] though, as Deissmann[2] reports from the Greek papyri, this term was also applied to the holders of other high offices. But can טבחים mean 'bodyguard'? Properly it means 'slaughterers,' *i.e.* of cattle, and hence 'cooks' (1 S. ix. 23 *f.*, see 𝔊); hence 𝔊 here gives *ἀρχιμάγειρος*. 'Chief cook,' however, is not probable in such a context. Nor can we accept 'chief executioner' (Del.)—surely a last resource for those who do not admit that טבחים can mean 'guardsmen.' It is true, *BDB* and Ges.-Buhl do accept 'guardsmen.' Robertson Smith remarks[3] that ancient warriors could upon occasion be butchers. But surely such a vague and obscure term for 'guardsmen' is not at all probable for an official title. What remains? The best solution of all—to suppose that טבח is one of those groups of letters which are likely to have arisen through the misplacement, omission, or mis-writing of letters in a larger word; it is this that remains to the consistent critic. Now, in xxii. 24 we find a name טבח (=בטח, 2 S. viii. 8), a group of letters which, in its context, and in the light of many of our previous results, can best be explained as an early corruption of רחבות;[4] cp. the strange-looking אבטחים (Num. xi. 5), which criticism compels us to regard as one of three ethnics inserted as a gloss on the ethnic אספים (MT. אספסף). To put it briefly, the probability is that the king of Miṣrim (Muṣri in N. Arabia) had a bodyguard of Rehobothites (cp. xxxvi. 37), and that, according to the narrative, Joseph's master was their commander. See, further, on xxxix. 20, and cp. on 2 K. xxv. 8.

[1] See 𝔊, 1 S. xxviii. 2, Esth. ii. 21.
[2] *Bibelstudien* (1895), pp. 93 *f.*
[3] *OTJC*(2), p. 262, note 1; so also *BDB*.
[4] See *E. Bib.*, 'Tebah.'

JUDAH AND TAMAR (GEN. XXXVIII.)

PROFESSEDLY a story from the life of Judah, a man of highly independent character, who goes his own way (cp. xxxvii. 26). Really a legendary record of the early relations of families or clans of the tribe of Judah, genealogically represented. With this it is difficult not to admit that certain mythological details have been connected. These details, however, are confined to that part of the narrative which relates to Tamar. The chapter has been, of late, much examined from different points of view,[1] but it still continues difficult to derive from it any clear view of the early movements of the original Judah. The suggestions of Winckler and Barton respectively—that the story of Judah and Tamar means the *conquest* of a place called Baal-tamar by David, and that a clan, perhaps the Kenites, which took the palm-tree for its totem, was incorporated into the tribe of Judah—are too imaginative to be accepted. Nor can we venture to hold with Erbt that the story of the daughter of 'Shua' has any relation to the story of Bath-sheba in the life of David, or that the deaths of Er and Onan are analogous to the attempted sacrifice of Isaac. It may be admitted, however, that the story of Judah and Tamar, like that of Ammon and Tamar in 2 S. xiii., is slightly coloured by some floating story, derived from the myth of the Babylonian Ishtar (see on *v.* 6), who is at once bride and sister of the beloved man; and if the story in chap. xxxviii. is rather paler than that in 2 Samuel, it may be because

[1] See Steuernagel, *Einwand.* pp. 79 *f.*; Winckler, *GI* ii. 104 *f.*, 202; Barton, *Semitic Origins*, pp. 90, 286; Gunkel, *Gen.* pp. 362 *ff.* (cp. *Deutsche Rundschau*, Oct. 1905, pp. 68 *f.*); Erbt, *Die Hebräer*, pp. 14-18; Wildeboer, *Theol. Studien*, 1900, pp. 261 *f.*; B. Luther and Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, pp. 177-180, 200-206, 433 *ff.*

Tamar in the former is not Judah's sister, but only his daughter-in-law. We may also compare the deaths of Tamar's husbands in *vv.* 7, 10 with the story of Sara and her husbands in Tobit iii. 8, which must be of mythological origin.

The names, however, have not been adequately studied,[1] and yet some interesting information might be expected from such a study. My own results definitely confirm the view that the original scene of the early legends was the N. Arabian border-land. *V.* 1 informs us that, after parting from his brethren, Judah allied himself to a certain Adullamite whose name was Ḥirah (*v.* 1). 'Adullam' is familiar to us as the name in the MT. of a place where David took refuge (1. S. xxii. 1); the phrase is מערת עדלם. It so happens that מערה is often (cp. on xxiii. 9, 1 S. *l.c.*) miswritten for רעמה = ראמה, a popular contraction of ירחמאל (see on x. 7), while עדלם must surely come either from עדמאל = אדבאל), an Ishmaelite tribal name (xxv. 13), or from ארמל (ארבאל), *i.e.* ירחמאל. מ׳ עד׳, therefore, is virtually a doubly written ירחמ׳. This view of עד׳ is confirmed by the true meaning of חירה, which is obviously (like חור) a corruption of אשחור, with the feminine ending. Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el (distinctly mentioned in *v.* 24—see below) was a N. Arabian region. It was not far from Canaan, for Num. xiii. 29 *b*, tells us that the Canaanites 'dwell by Yaman,' and Gen. x. 6 (see note) that Canaan was a son of Ḥam, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el.

V. 2 tells us that while at Adullam (?) Judah married the daughter of a Canaanite named שוע, *i.e.* not שׁוּעַ, but שַׁוַּע (𝔊 Σαυα) or שֶׁוַע = שֶׁבַע; cp. בת־שוע, 1 Chr. iii. 5; שבע, of course, is = שמע (see on x. 7). By 'Shua' or 'Sheba' Judah has three sons—offshoots of the older clan, presumably. The first is called ער (Er), which must be grouped with ערי (xlvi. 16), ערן (Num. xxvi. 36), עיר (1 Chr. vii. 12), עירי (1 Chr. vii. 7), עירא (2 S. xx. 26, xxiii. 38), עירו (1 Chr. iv. 15), עירם (xxxvi. 43). All that Nöldeke (*E. Bib.*, 'Names,' § 77) can tell us about these forms is that they are 'difficult to explain.' Ed. Meyer has no suggestion. A new point of view, however, can suggest something, and if it does tend

[1] Steuernagel's attempt (p. 80) to identify several of them with names in the Amarna letters is too hazardous (the land of Gari = ער).

to restore some of the credit of the Chronicler and the Priestly Writer, fair-minded persons will not be vexed at this. So, then, from 1 Chr. vii. 12 we learn that עיר is an Ashḥurite name (for אחר see on xxii. 13), and from iv. 15 that עירו was a Calebite; also from Gen. xlvi. 43 that עירם was the name of a clan of Esau. From lists in 2 Samuel (xx. 26, xxiii. 38) we know that עירא was a Yairite or Ithrite name (Yair = Yeraḥme'el; Yether = Ashtar). I leave the critical reader to complete the references. Evidently עיר or ער is the kernel of a name widely spread in early times in the N. Arabian border-land, and how can we doubt that the full name was some form (perhaps ערל; see on chap. xxxiv.) of ירחמאל? — The second, אונן (Onan), is also quite a N. Arabian name (see on Ben-oni, xxxv. 18).—The third, שלה (Shelah), has to be grouped with שילה, שאול, שועל (see on 1 S. i. 20, ix. 4)—all connected with ישמעאל.

These three clans, then, were partly Israelite, partly Canaanite; the two former perished early. At the time of the 'birth' of the last one, his mother was at כזיב (read והיא, with 𝔊); a fuller form of the name is אכזיב. This place, according to Josh. xv. 44, lay in the far south of the Judahite land, near Ke'ilah and Mareshah. Apparently it was the place occupied by the Shelah clan; cp. 1 Chr. iv. 21 *f.*, where 'Shelah' and 'Cozeba' (cognate with 'Akzib') are combined. There was doubtless a northern Akzib (Josh. xix. 29), but the name was carried from the south, and originally meant 'Ashḥur-Ishmael' (see p. 432); אכ from אכש (= Ashḥur), and זיב = זאב = זבול (= Ishmael). Cp. on 1 S. xxi. 10 (Akish), Judg. vii. 25 (Zeeb).

Next, the story of Er's wife (*v.* 6). Her origin is not told us—only her name, תמר, which was no doubt understood as 'palm-tree.' An appropriate name, doubtless, for a woman (cp. Cant. vii. 8 *f.*). But we have also the place-names Tamar and Baal-tamar, and we have to find an explanation which will fit both the personal name and the place-names. Such an explanation has been offered by Winckler, according to whom Baal-tamar (Judg. xx. 33) was the place where the men of Benjamin had their tribal sanctuary, dedicated to the goddess Ishtar. When David conquered it, thinks this scholar, its name was changed to

Baal-yehudah (2 S. vi. 2). This, however, as it seems to me, is opposed by a sound textual criticism. The improbable phrase עיר [ה]תמרים, 'city of the palm-trees' (Dt. xxxiv. 3, Judg. i. 16, iii. 13, 2 Chr. xxviii. 15), supplies no justification of a city called 'Palm-tree' (תמר). Winckler himself (*GI* ii. 104) boldly reads עיר התמרים, 'city of the two Tamars,' the deity referred to being androgynous. A most improbable correction! If we assume metathesis, a much more probable result follows. Just as מחול (1 K. v. 11) comes from ירחמאל, and שלם (xiv. 18, xxxiii. 18) from ישמעאל, so תמר naturally comes from רָמַת,[1] and תמרים from רמתים (1 S. i. 1).[2] Nor can we be surprised that 'Tamar' (*i.e.* Ramath or Ramith) should be the name both of a sister and of a daughter of Ab-shalom, for underneath Ab-shalom lies 'Arab-shalem,' *i.e.* Shalemite (Ishmaelite) Arabia.' That there should be both a Tamar and a Baal-tamar among southern localities is also not more strange than that there should be several Ramahs. And if it should be asked how it came about that mythological motives (see above) should have become attached to the name Tamar (Ramath), the answer is that the southern Ram or Aram was the home of popular superstitions, and that the cult of the great goddess Ashtart, otherwise called Ramith, Shabʿith, etc. (see *e.g.* p. 18, note 2), was specially flourishing there. From that region, too, the Israelites probably got the *ḳedēshōth*,[3] one of whom Tamar (Ramath) appeared to be by her clothing (*vv.* 14 *f.*).

Next come two place-names,—in *v.* 12, תמנה, and in *v.* 14 פתח עינים. The former is not 'allotment' (√מנה), but, like תימן and תמנע (xxxvi. 12), a popular modification of יתמען = ישמעאל, with the feminine ending. Naturally there were several Timnahs. Among them notice תמנת חרס, *i.e.* Timnah of Ashḥur (see on Judg. ii. 9). As to the second name, עינים (cp. ימנע, 1 Chr. vii. 35) probably comes from ימען = ישמעאל. Can it be the [ה]עינם of Josh. xv. 34? Not far off occur עדלם (עדבל, see on *v.* 1), and, just before,

[1] In *Test. XII. Patr.*, 'Judah,' 10, by a curious coincidence Tamar is actually called 'a daughter of Aram.'

[2] Similarly, איתמר (Ithamar) will come from ערב־רמת, 'Yeraḥme'elite (Ramathite) Arabia.'

[3] Stade, *Gesch.* i. 258.

תפוח. Perhaps both here and in Josh. *l.c.* we should read נפתוח ישמ׳. See on 'Naphtuḥim,' x. 13, and cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Nephtoah,' 'Tappuah,' 'Pahath-Moab.'

By a singular fate, a gloss on עינים (which occurs without פתח in *v.* 21) has intruded into *v.* 24 (beginning). The gloss is והוא ישמ׳ אשחור, 'it is (in) Ishmael-Asshur.' It is disguised, no doubt, just as, in *v.* 5, 'Asshur-Ishmael' is strangely disguised. The text gives us ויהי ׀ כמשלש חדשים (note the warning Paseḳ). In this there are two difficulties: (1) the double preposition, and (2) שלש for שלשת. For the first, it is usual to refer to 1 S. x. 27, but the text there is corrupt (see *Crit. Bib.* p. 214). It is true, however, that a light is reflected from that passage, critically read, on the present. No one can doubt that, as ויהי כמחריש represents the original והוא בחשרם ('it is in Ḥashram'), so the words quoted above represent והוא בישמעאל חשרם ('it is in Ishmael-Ḥashram'). In both cases חשרם represents Ashḥur-Yeraḥ-me'el (cp. on כשדים, xi. 31).

Vv. 29 and 30 give the names of Judah's two sons as פרץ and זרח. The former can be explained on the analogy of תמר; it is a popular version of צרף, *i.e.* צרפת; cp. צרפים, Neh. iii. 32, from צרפתים, and on 'Baal-peraṣim,' 2 S. v. 20. The latter has no connexion with אזרח, 'autochthonous'[1] but is a distortion of אשחר = שחר; note 'Zeraḥ the Kushite' (כוש probably comes from אשחר = כש; cp. on x. 6). Cp. חצור, also from אשחור. To the story of the birth of the twins reference has already been made (on xxv. 22). Evidently there was a floating popular myth of the struggle of the Twins (the Gemini) which attached itself to different names.

[1] Stade, *Gesch.* i. 258.

FORTUNES OF JOSEPH IN MIṢRIM (GEN. XXXIX.)

ACCORDING to the Yahwist (J), Joseph is sold as a slave to a Miṣrite (the redactor inserted 'Potiphar,' etc.), who, perceiving his worth, makes him his house-steward. Such an officer, with a short stick or a writing-tablet in his hand, and a pen behind his ear, is delineated in countless Egyptian tomb-chambers. That in some cases the Egyptian steward was a Syrian, can surprise no one. The influx of Semites into the Nile-valley, and the ease with which they rose to high positions, are undeniable facts. But equally undeniable is it—though monumental evidence is wanting—that N. Arabian Miṣrites, enriched by commerce, must have required house-stewards, and these may sometimes have been Hebrews.

The same narrator (J) tells how the wife of Joseph's master cast her eyes upon the young man, and made immoral proposals to him from which he could only escape by flight. Is this episode specially Egyptian in colouring? It has indeed a novelistic appearance, and, arguing from its unimportance in relation to the plot of the story,[1] we may plausibly regard it as a later insertion, and assume that in its original form it had an Egyptian setting. And if we look out for an Egyptian tale from which the Hebrew story may have been derived, we may be tempted, like some of our predecessors, to fix on the often-quoted tale of the Two Brothers.[2]

[1] Novelistic, because in real life Joseph would have been far more severely punished (see Diod. Sic. i. 78) for the crime imputed to him. Unimportant for the plot, as E's version of the story, which represents Joseph as an overseer of the prisoners, but not as himself a prisoner, sufficiently shows.

[2] See Flinders Petrie, *Ancient Egyptian Tales*, ii. 36 *ff.*; Maspero,

I doubt greatly, however, whether the original J presented the story of Joseph with an Egyptian setting. It is a well-known fact that similar tales to that of Potiphar's wife occur in widely separated literatures.[1] Admittedly the Egyptian women were far from perfect,[2] but why should they have been worse than the women of the N. Arabian Muṣri? Certainly enough is said of the shamelessness of the adulterous woman in the Book of Proverbs, the sayings in which—there is good reason to think—were modelled on Arabian patterns.

It is worth noticing that, in his dealings with his master's wife (*vv.* 8 *f.*), Joseph makes his appeal to the same moral and religious standards which he had known at home. This seems to point to N. Arabia. And yet, in spite of this, the Miṣrite woman, when infuriated by Joseph's resistance, assumes in the other inmates of the house a racial contempt for the Hebrew (*vv.* 14, 17; cp. xliii. 32, xlvi. 34). Are we to ascribe this and other difficult points in the Joseph-story to an editor who cherished the theory that by the name מצרים the narrators must have meant Egypt?

Falsely accused to his master, Joseph is put into the *bēth-hassōhar*. Yahweh, however, gives him favour with the governor, who in his turn gives Joseph the care of the other prisoners. Is there anything Egyptian here? Attempts have been made to show that *sōhar* in *bēth-hassōhar* (xxxix. 20, xl. 3, 5) is the Hebraised form of an Egyptian word, but, as Driver (Hastings' *DB*, p. 768 *a*, note ||) admits, unsuccessful ones. Other scholars have suggested as the meaning 'house of roundness,' which is supposed to be confirmed by אגן הסהר, 'a round bowl (?),' in Cant. vii. 3. We have been so well served, however, by the N. Arabian theory in the case of Potiphar or Poti-phera', that we may well decline to accept this view of the meaning of סהר both in our passage and in Cant. *l.c.* For סהר the Sam. text gives סחר. To those who have some experience of the ways of the scribes, this at once suggests חרם (Judg. i. 35,

Contes de l'Égypte ancienne, pp. 3-32. It was written for Seti II. (nineteenth dynasty), and is handed down in the d'Orbiney papyrus.

[1] See A. Lang, *Myth, Ritual, and Religion*, ii. 303 *ff.*

[2] See Heyes, *Bib. u. Aeg.* pp. 140 *ff.*

viii. 13), which has most probably come from an original אַשְׁחֻר; also סרחים (Am. vi. 4, 7), from אשחרים. Now Ashḥur—the name is in such cases disguised as Tarshish—is described as famous for its silver[1] (Jer. x. 9), and Joseph, when grand vizier of Miṣrim, is related to have had a silver divining-cup (xliv. 2). It is very probable that, just as people spoke of a 'mantle of Shinar' and the like (see on xxxvii. 3), so they may sometimes have spoken of a 'bowl of Ashḥur'[2] (read אגן אשחר, Cant. *l.c.*), and, in a technical sense, of a 'house of Ashḥur' (בית אש׳). By the latter phrase they would probably have meant the same as בית מלוא (probably from ב׳ ירח׳), which seems to have meant a fortified place at Jerusalem, devoted to the N. Arabian troops—the so-called Kerethites and Pelethites (see on 2 S. v. 9, 2 K. xii. 21). It should be remembered that, if our view is right (see on xxxvii. 36), Potiphar was, in E, 'captain of the Rehobothites,' *i.e.* of the royal bodyguard of N. Arabians.

That the references to ב׳ הס׳ (*i.e.* ב׳ אשחור) all belong to J is admitted. It may be added that these references (xxxix. 20, xl. 3, 5) very possibly imply a false interpretation of the phrase—an interpretation which seems based on the reading בית האסור, 'house of him who is bound.' The original phrase, however, meant 'house of Asshur,' *i.e.* of the royal Asshurite bodyguard. Let us not forget the captain's second name, Asshur-arâb (see on xxxvii. 36).

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Silver,' 'Tarshish.'

[2] Cp. also Ezra i. 10, where the troublesome משנים is a corruption of ישמעאלים = ישמנים. The whole phrase thus becomes 'bowls of silver of the Ishmaelites.' Cp. on xli. 43.

DREAMS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE (GEN. XL.)

HOW Joseph interprets the dreams of two high court officials, who were put 'in ward' till their case could be tried. Here Winckler[1] discovers another possible Tamûz-motive in the story of Joseph. Tamûz, as the god of vegetation, may be represented either by the baker, in so far as he suffers a cruel fate, or by the butler, in so far as he is raised out of his humiliation. As to the functions of the butler and the baker in Egypt, much has been learnedly written, but one may remark that these court offices existed in other countries besides Egypt. And if Egypt abounded in vines and in corn, one may venture to say that the country called Miṣṣōr or Miṣrim was at any rate not without these precious plants. Miṣrim (Muṣri) and the Negeb are not indeed the same country, but it may be well to recall that miles of hill-sides and valleys of the region which E. H. Palmer calls the Negeb are 'covered with the small stone-heaps in regular swathes, along which the grapes were trained, and which still retain the name of *teleilât-el-'anab*, or grape-mounds.'[2] Apart from this, it is difficult not to infer from the facts of textual criticism[3] that there were districts in the N. Arabian border-land and in the kingdom of Muṣri in which, by the help of irrigation, the soil was enabled to produce both grain and grapes. See *e.g.* the passages quoted already on xii. 10-20 (Abraham driven by a famine into Miṣrim), and add to these

[1] *Arab.-semit.-orient.* p. 212, note 1; but cp. Jeremias, *Babylonisches im N.T.* p. 21.

[2] *The Desert of the Exodus*; cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Negeb,' §§ 6 *f.*

[3] See *Critica Biblica* (1904) and *The Book of Psalms* (1904) on the passages referred to.

Ps. civ. 15, which contains the interpolated gloss, 'bringing forth vines in Ishmael, producing bread-corn in Ishmael'; also with regard to vine-culture, see Gen. xlix. 11, Judg. ix. 27, xv. 5, and, with special regard to Miṣrim, the definite language of Ps. lxxx. 9. 'Of course, there were large tracts in this region which were incapable of improvement; *e.g.* in Num. xx. 5 the wilderness of Kadesh is contrasted with Miṣrim in being "no place of seed, or of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates"; but this does not affect our general statement.'[1] That the interpretation of dreams was no exclusive possession of the wise men of Egypt, still less needs to be insisted upon.

MORE DREAMS AND INTERPRETATIONS
(Gen. xli. 1-32)

How the king dreamed, and how Joseph alone was able to interpret the dreams. The first dream attracts us most, because it is full of touches of local colour; may we add that they are Egyptian? Certainly the cow was the sacred animal of Isis. But the cow was also sacred to Ishtar, and indeed was a natural symbol of the procreative power of nature[2] wherever this most ancient of deities was worshipped. That Ishtar or Ashtar (whence Ashtoreth, Astarte) was worshipped in Arabia as well as in Palestine is beyond question. It is remarkable, however,

[1] Cheyne, *Book of Psalms*[(2)] (1904), i. 120 *b*.

[2] Cp. the mythological cow called in Egyptian *mehetuer* or *meḥ urt* ('the full, the great'; or 'the great fulness'), who was regarded as the motive power in the cosmogony, and as the source of being to gods and men (Brugsch, *Rel. u. Myth.* pp. 115 *f.*, 168, 340; cp. Heyes, *Bib. u. Aeg.* p. 214). The title may originally have referred to the Nile.

that seven cows should be spoken of, and that they should be said to have come up out of the river. Is not this Egyptian? In chap. cxlviii. of the 'Book of the Dead' we read of seven sacred cows which were called upon to give bread and beer, and abundance of all sorts, to the Osirian soul. The sacred number seven, whatever its origin, represents abundance and completeness, and the choice of the cow, rather than any other animal, was dictated by the sacred symbolism already referred to, while the coming up out of the Nile would suggest that the abundant vegetation of Egypt was conditional on the overflow of the Nile. Still, we must remember that to all the Semitic peoples seven had a symbolic meaning, and that, as we have already found (on ii. 11-14), the rivers of Paradise were identified, by a kind of patriotic Arabian extravagance, with the streams of the N. Arabian border-land, which accounts for the description of the N. Arabian Canaan as a land flowing with milk and honey (Num. xiv. 27). Originally Paradise was in the upper world,[1] and the river which watered it was the mythic river of milk and honey, of which we have a monument in the phrase 'the Milky Way.' To transfer the scene of the Paradise-myth to earth involved much geographical difficulty, especially when the single river had become four streams, corresponding to the four quarters of the heaven. What we have before us, however, in the first of the king's dreams seems to be based upon the simpler view that there was but one river of Paradise, which river could indeed be identified with the Nile, but could also by an imaginative licence be identified with the N. Arabian stream called ירחון.

The Egyptian theory is therefore not the only possible one. And there are certain points in the language which have not been hitherto considered, and which favour the view that in the original text the background was N. Arabian. For instance, it is commonly supposed that the word יאר, or (with article) היאר (*v.* 1, etc.), is the special Hebrew name[2] for the Nile, or (in plural) for branches or canals of the Nile, and that אחו (*v.* 2) is the Hebraised form of the Egyptian

[1] See on ii. 10-14, and *E. Bib.*, col. 3577.

[2] An Egyptian origin is usually supposed (*E. Bib.*, 'Nile,' § 1; cp. *BDB*, *s.v.* יאר). The Assyrian name is Yaru'u.

word for the reeds which grew beside the Nile. Let us devote ourselves first to the former point.

It is admitted that there are exceptions to what is held to be the general usage. In Dan. xii. 5, 6, 7 (cp. x. 4) יְאֹר is held to refer to the Tigris,[1] and in Isa. xxxiii. 21 to mean rivers (‖ נהרים) such as those by which great imperial cities were erected—a poetical application; while in Job xxviii. 10 it is commonly rendered 'shafts' (with reference to mining). But this admission is not enough. The rendering 'stream of the Nile,' 'river Nile,' given by *BDB* as the usual meaning is not by any means certain. There is good reason to think that the country where the stream called יְאֹר flowed was not Egypt but the N. Arabian borderland, which the early Hebrew writers, exaggerating, represented as a land of streams and canals or watercourses (see on Gen. xv. 18). Nor must we be too positive that the stories of Joseph and of the plagues which preceded the Exodus, *in their original form*, referred to the Nile, because, as is here shown, the evidence points in more than one direction. It is highly probable that even in Genesis and Exodus יְאֹר, like יאיר and יעיר, is a worn-down and corrupt form of ירחמאל, by which is meant the נחל ירחמאל. Another modification of the same name, as applied to a stream, is ירחון, which later scribes misread as ירדן, the Jordan being familiar to them, but not the Yarḥon. For a decisive proof of this I have already (see on Gen. xiii. 10) referred to the phrase ירדן ירחו in Num. xxii. 1 (see *Crit. Bib.* on Josh. xvi. 1), where ירחו (= ירחו׳), *i.e.* ירחון, is an early correction of ירדן.

From the stream we naturally pass on to its banks. The cows which the king sees in his dream feed in the אחו (*v.* 2). Gunkel renders this word 'marsh-grass,' following Jerome, who, handing on some scholarly tradition, interprets 'omne quod in palude virens nascitur.' Gunkel's version,

[1] Tuch (*Genesis*, p. 442) accounts for this exceptional use by the consideration that Daniel is only a copy of Joseph. But if so, how is it that the model is not more strictly followed? The riddle cannot be solved from the ordinary point of view. The strong probability is that חדקל (x. 4) is a corruption of a compound name, the first part of which is either חדר or חר[אש], and the latter קל[מ], *i.e.* ירחמאל.

however, is not strictly accurate. There is indeed a demotic root 'to be green' with which *aḥu* may plausibly be connected, but considering Job viii. 11 (where אחו is || to גמא) and Sirach xl. 16 (where 𝔊's *αχει* corresponds to קרמיות), we are bound to render, not 'marsh-grass,' but 'reeds.' But here a grave textual question arises. Is אחו in *v.* 2 the original reading? An editor who wished to give an Egyptian colouring to the story of Joseph would very naturally misread an indistinctly written word so as to favour his theory. And it so happens that there is a word out of which אחו may easily have arisen, and suitable to the supposed original connexion. The dictionaries, based as they are on MT., may only recognise the tree-name תאשור, but there is good evidence[1] that אשור and אשחור, the latter sometimes corrupted into הדס[2] (see on Neh. viii. 15), were collateral forms of this name, and were applied to the same tree, which, as we learn from Isa. xli. 19, lx. 13, grew in a highland district called Lebanon. This 'Lebanon' can hardly have been the Syrian mountain-region of that name, but was more probably in the N. Arabian border-land,[3] and there was apparently much water in its neighbourhood. In Ezek. xxxi. 3 (revised text) Ashḥur (*i.e.* in one of its larger senses, including Miṣrim)[4] is compared to an *'erez* in Lebanon, a tree of great size, and fond of moisture;[5] in Hos. xiii. 15 (revised text) 'Ephraim,' *i.e.* the S. Ephraim (whence the northern Ephraimites must have migrated), is said to 'bear fruit among the asshur-trees,' and from chap. xiv. it is clear that the prophet's imagery is taken from the (southern) Lebanon. Our conclusion, therefore, is that in the original form of the story it was most probably not

[1] See Dt. xvi. 21, Ps. civ. 17 *b*, Neh. viii. 15, where אשחר underlies the present reading.

[2] In Isa. lv. 13 הדס (אשחר) is || to ברוש.

[3] See *Crit. Bib.* on Jer. xxii. 20, and note that there was a 'Lebanon' near Carthage, and a cult of בעל לבנן in Cyprus (see p. 31).

[4] To preclude the possibility of error—so long as the text should be correctly copied—a glossator inserted אשחר ישמעאל, 'Ashḥur of Ishmael' (see *Crit. Bib. ad loc.*).

[5] Cp. Num. xxiv. 5, 'like *'erez*-trees beside water.' E.V. 'cedar-trees'; but 'the cedar of Lebanon does not grow in moist places' (Post. in Hastings' *DB*).

'among the reeds' (באחו) that the seven cows were represented as feeding, but 'באשחו, *i.e.* בָּאַשְׁחוּרִים, 'by the ashḥur-trees.' The type of corruption is a common one; cp., for instance, אחיו (as in xvi. 12, xxv. 18), אחר (as in ix. 28, xxii. 13, Hos. v. 8), and אחי in compound proper names. This may give us a clue to the original text of Isa. xix. 7, where 𝔊 has *τὸ αχει*, and MT. ערות; underlying both is perhaps אשחרות.

I may repeat once more that I do not attempt to expound the geography of the earlier Hebrew narrators. I can only make suggestions which arise naturally out of critically revised texts. So much, at least, appears to be probable—that in a more original and shorter form the story of Joseph had a N. Arabian and not a Palestinian and Egyptian background, and consequently that 'Pharaoh, king of Egypt,' should be 'Pir'u,[1] king of Miṣrim.' The land in which the events related take place was a land of corn and wine, of streams and canals. It was also a land of trees, and *ashḥur*-trees, which delighted in moisture, grew by the side of the river.

And now as to the relations between the Miṣrites and the Hebrews or 'sons of Jacob.' It is true that the Miṣrites and the Hebrews could not eat together (xliii. 32) on the ground that the Hebrews were addicted to a mode of life which indicated a far lower degree of culture than that of the Miṣrites (cp. on xlvi. 34 *b*). But this did not place a bar on all intercourse, nor on the adoption of a Hebrew as a Miṣrite. A religious difference there must also have been; this would be the natural result of a difference of culture. In the time of Joseph, however, there was on both sides less consciousness of religious difference than afterwards. This appears from passages like xxxix. 5, 9, 21, 23, xl. 8, and especially xliii. 23 (where notice the warm religious sympathy manifested by the steward towards the brethren; cp. xlii. 18). And this view, as I hope, is confirmed by a soundly methodical and intrinsically probable correction of the strange reading בלעדי in xli. 16. The word is generally thought to mean 'not at all myself,' which is taken to be a formula of deprecation; but the only parallel for such a

[1] Or perhaps ʿArāb (see on xii. 15).

use of the word is xiv. 24, and there, as we have seen, בלעדי has most probably grown out of ירבעל, an incorrect popular form of ירחמאל. The only natural meaning of the phrase is 'without me,' or 'apart from me'; cp. בלעדיך, *v.* 44. 𝔊, however, connects בל׳ with אלהים, and inserts לא; plausible, but arbitrary. As it seems to me, the true reading is ירחמ׳ אלהים, which appears to have been one of the names of the God of Israel (see pp. 99 *ff.*). In other words, Joseph and the reigning king of Miṣrim, in spite of a difference in religious customs, at any rate worshipped God under the same compound name.

The disputed phrase occurs in a conversation between Joseph and the king of Miṣrim. It will be seen that from the very first Joseph has no difficulty whatever in his intercourse with the Miṣrites. In fact, his case is parallel to that of Abram in מצרים, and of Abraham and Isaac in Gerar. The only apparent inconsistency is in xlii. 23, where Joseph is said to have spoken to his brethren by an interpreter (lit. 'the interpreter was between them'). But can we suppose that in his dealings with his master and (see on xxxix. 8 *f.*) his master's wife, also with his fellow-prisoners, and with the king, Joseph was dependent on a dragoman? Surely not. It was convenient at this point to assume that Joseph would not understand the free outpouring of the guilty souls of his brethren, and so, just here, the narrator introduced an interpreter; but the detail was an inconsistency. We may admit that in later times the Arabian invaders spoke a tongue not understood by the people of Judah (Jer. v. 15, Isa. xxxiii. 19), but the early traditions (as it appears to me) represent the Israelites, the Yeraḥme'elites, the Miṣrites, and the Philistines (Pelethites?) as speaking either the same tongue, or dialects of the same tongue which were not too widely different for mutual intercourse. This result is in harmony with the results of my own inquiries into proper names. I fear that Egyptological lore has been a rather doubtful boon to Biblical commentators.

One difference, however, between the king of Miṣrim and Joseph there appears to have been. The king of Miṣrim believed in oneiromancy; he therefore sends for 'all the *ḥarṭummim* and wise men.' Joseph, on the other hand,

is convinced that the interpretation of dreams is not a matter for learned pedantry, but for direct divine revelation[1] (xl. 8). And who are the *ḥarṭummim*? According to *BDB*, 'the fact that the word is always applied to Egyptian magicians, except Dan. ii. 2 (late), suggests Egyptian origin, but no agreement [exists] among Egyptologists.' According to Gunkel, 'the etymological and precise meaning is unknown.' Dillmann, it is true, derives from חרט, and Tuch from חרט and חרם, but this is not satisfactory. If the scene of the story be in Egypt, we must expect the Hebraised form of some Egyptian term, but who can produce a corresponding Egyptian term for 'magicians'? Ḥar-tot, mentioned by Brugsch, means 'warrior (priest).' The expressions quoted by *BDB* are conjectural. The ἱερογραμματεῖς of Diod. Sic. i. 87 cannot be shown to be *ḥarṭummim*. Let us, then, extend our survey. *BDB*'s description of Dan. ii. 2 as 'late' need not hinder us from utilising the fact that Nebuchadrezzar, king of Bâbel, had *ḥarṭummim* (Dan. i. 20, ii. 2, 10, 27, iv. 4, v. 11). This is another of the striking parallelisms between the story of Joseph and that of Daniel, and, as in the case of יאר, the parallelism points the way to the best solution of the problem. As we have already seen (on x. 10) בבל is often a corruption of the name (or of one of the names) of the leading N. Arabian kingdom, and though that kingdom was not what is so often called Miṣrim, yet it must have been equally pervaded by Yeraḥme'elite culture and superstition. The 'wise men' and magicians of N. Arabia were, of course, Yeraḥme'elites, and 'Yeraḥme'elites' became, to the Israelitish writers, a synonym for 'wise men' and magicians (see on 1 K. v. 11, and cp. on Isa. ii. 6). Turn now to Dan. ii. 2 and its parallels, which contain a longer list of terms for 'magicians' than we find in Exodus. One of these terms is clearly an ethnic—כשדים. As we have seen (on xi. 31), this word, spelt כשדם, comes ultimately from אַשְׁחֻר אֲרָם. The easiest solution of our problem seems

[1] It is Joseph's respect for the king which speaks in the phrase 'will give an answer of peace.' The 'answer' is the dream, which has presumably been preceded by a question. Cp. Winckler, *AOF* xxi. 447.

to be that כשרמ׳ (so we should read) was in the original story of Daniel at once a variant to and a correction of חרטמים. The two forms may reasonably be held to be ultimately identical, *i.e.* חרטמים comes from חרשמים (ש and ט confounded; cp. MT. 1 S. xiv. 32), and this from חשרמים, *i.e.* אַשְׁחֹר אֲרָם, with the plural termination added. In fact, not only Yerahme'el (Aram) but Ashhur (under the form Ezrah) was proverbial for wisdom (1 K. v. 11). From the expression חרטמי מצרים in Ex. vii. 11 we may infer either that the corrupt חרטמי already stood in the text and was interpreted 'magicians,' or that 'Ashhur-Arammite' had already obtained an appellative force.[1]

JOSEPH'S PROSPERITY (GEN. XLI. 33-57)

THE section relates how Joseph made a practical suggestion in anticipation of the seven years of famine (cp. *v.* 34 with xlvii. 26), and how the king appointed him to carry his suggestion into effect in the capacity of grand vizier. How Joseph married into a priestly family, and had two sons; also how he amassed a large quantity of corn in the granaries of every city. It is natural that this should have been illustrated from Egyptian sources.[2] The directorship of the granaries, for instance, was one of the most important state-offices. Usually, indeed, it was distinct from the viziership, but we cannot be surprised if, under special circumstances, the two offices were combined.

[1] Hommel's proposed connexion of ח׳ with Bab. *ḳardamu*, the name of a class of priests (*Exp. T.* xi. 234) may here be recorded.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Joseph,' § 7; Hastings' *DB*, 'Joseph,' p. 773 *a*; Tomkins, *Life and Times of Joseph*, pp. 48 *f.* (Naville).

Next, as to horses and chariots. These first appear on Egyptian monuments under the eighteenth dynasty. It appears, however, that horses were introduced under the Hyksos. We cannot, therefore, say that if the scene of the story be in Egypt horses and chariots cannot have been referred to. The passages affected by this question are fairly numerous. References to horses (beside asses) occur in xlvii. 17, also (beside asses and camels) in Ex. ix. 3, and (with chariots) in Ex. xiv. 9, 23, xv. 19, and references to chariots (without horses) in xli. 43, xlvi. 29, l. 9, Ex. xiv. 6 *f.*, 17, 25, 28, xv. 4. I maintain, however, that horses and chariots also existed in the land of Muṣri, so that, in spite of these references, the scene of the original story may have been in N. Arabia.

I am aware of the strong opposition of Prof. Ridgeway[1] to the opinion of the antiquity of the horse in Arabia;[2] but it seems to me less hazardous to suppose that horses were early known in Arabia than to admit such strange anachronisms on the part of the editor of the Joseph-story. I would also call attention to four points. (1) We are told in xli. 43 that the king caused Joseph to ride במרכבת המשנה, a phrase which is usually explained 'in the second chariot after that reserved for the king alone,' but which textual criticism shows to be (as also in 2 Chr. xxxv. 24) a corruption or alteration of במ' ישמן, 'in a chariot of Ishman' (*i.e.* 'of Ishmael'). I fail to see how המשנה can be called a probable reading; a second-best chariot would have spoiled the whole affair. Besides, the same scribal error which is here supposed occurs (as I think it can be shown) elsewhere.[3] Accepting this result, we may fairly ask whether Egyptians would be likely to send for chariots to N. Arabia, and point out that, as if to prevent any mistake, close upon the mention of the chariot we find the gloss Abrek, which cannot be more plausibly and

[1] *The Thoroughbred Horse* (1905).

[2] See, however, W. S. Blunt's criticisms on Ridgeway in the *Nineteenth Century and After*, January 1906, pp. 58-71.

[3] *E.g.* in 2 K. xxii. 14, Zeph. i. 10, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 22, Neh. xi. 9. Cp. also משכנים, from ישבנים, 1 S. xv. 9, Ezra i. 10, and see on the tribal name מנשה, *v.* 51.

methodically explained than as a shortened form of Arab-Reḳem, 'Arabia of Reḳem' (see below).

(2) The next point is that the early tradition states very positively that Yabin, king of Ḥaṣor (*i.e.* of Ashḥur) was rich in horses and chariots (Josh. xi. 4; cp. Judg. iv. 3). It is, no doubt, commonly held that Yabin's Ḥaṣor was in the north, near lake Hûleh. The identification, however, of the Waters of Merom with the waters of Hûleh is most precarious. Moreover, in 1 K. ix. 15 we find Ḥaṣor mentioned with places in or near the south country, and the other places called in MT. Ḥaṣor are decidedly not northern localities. If the king of Ḥaṣor had horses and chariots, another southern king—that of Miṣrim—may be supposed to have had them too.

(3) We next have to take account of the results of a close study of 1 K. x. 28 *f.*[1] If there were horses in N. Arabia, it would be natural that Solomon should import his horses from thence; and textual criticism appears to me strongly to confirm this. It is not thereby proved that the horses were bred in Muṣri. From Ezek. xxvii. 14 we learn that the great commercial country of Miṣṣōr (shortened into Ṣōr) imported horses from 'Togarmah.' This regional name is probably corrupted from Tubal-gamrah (or the like), a compound name, both parts of which point in the first instance to Arabia.

And (4) for extra-Biblical testimony to the existence of horses in N. Arabia take this from the great Khorsabad inscription of Sargon (*l.* 27; *KB* ii. 55)—'Tribute from Pir'u the king of Mu-su-ri, Samsi the queen of Aribi, It'amara the Sabæan, gold, productions of the mountains, horses, camels, I received.' The evidence quoted on the side of the opposition is not early.

If I understand the texts aright, the horses of Asshur were famed for their swiftness (Nah. iii. 2; cp. 'Asshur,' *v.* 18). So also were those of 'Kasdim' (Hab. i. 8; cp. 'Kasdim,' *v.* 6). 'Kasdim' and 'Asshur' must have been

[1] See *Crit. Bib.* p. 336. Solomon's horses were imported from Miṣrim and Maakah (1 K. *l.c.*). The obscure במחיר and ותעלה come from בירחם and הוא אתבעל. The regions intended were 'in Yarḥam, that is Ethbaal'; *i.e.* N. Arabian.

rather close together, or rather Kasram (so we should read for Kasdim), *i.e.* Ashḥur-Aram, was probably a part of Ashḥur.[1] And the poetical picture of the war-horse (Job xxxix. 19-25), so unique in the O.T., comes from a writer who may well be supposed to have resided long in Arabia.

And now, what were the honours and rewards of which Joseph was the recipient? 'Thou shalt be over my house,' says the king (*v.* 40); the parallel line ought by rights to expand this idea. The text runs, ועל-פיך יִשַּׁק כל-עמי, which Gunkel translates, 'thy words shall my whole people obey.' In fact, 𝔊 renders the verb *ὑπακούσεται.* True, but what is the Hebrew phrase presupposed by this? Certainly not ישק על. Possibly 𝔊 may have read יקשיב (cp. 𝔊, Prov. ii. 2); but the sense is not strong enough. פיך, too, though 𝔊 read it, must be wrong.[2] In Prov. xv. 14 פיך should be פניך. So here, while ישק has probably come from ישתחוה.[3] Thus we get, 'and before thee shall all thy people bow down.'

Next comes the formal presentation of the insignia of office, specially the royal seals with which all state documents were sealed (*v.* 42). Does this point to Egypt? Certainly, but not more than to other countries. See Esth. iii. 10, viii. 2, Tobit i. 22, 1 Macc. vi. 15. We learn too that Joseph was clad in 'garments of *shesh*,' *i.e.* of fine linen. But even here we are compelled to deny that there is any distinctively Egyptian colouring. First, because in a list of Egyptian honours a particular garment —the so-called *shendi-t*—would have been mentioned; 'garments of fine linen' were worn by all Egyptians of rank; and next, because fine linen was produced, not only in Miṣrim (Ezek. xxvii. 7), but in Aram, *i.e.* Yerahme'el in Arabia (*ibid. v.* 16), and also in Judah (1 Chr. iv. 21; cp. Josh. ii. 6, Hos. ii. 7, 11, Prov. xxxi. 13). True, שֵׁשׁ is usually supposed to be an Egyptian loan-word, but the support for this view derived from Ezek. xxvii. 7, compared

[1] That 'Asshur' (= Ashḥur) in Nah. iii. 2 is an Arabian region is shown in *Crit. Bib. ad loc.* For 'Kasdim' (from 'Kasram') see on xi. 28.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Salutations,' § 2.

[3] For a similar confusion see 1 K. ii. 19, where cp. 𝔊.

with *v.* 16, is a precarious one. Those who hold that שֵׁשׁ comes from the Egyptian *šeš*[1] are obliged to suppose that there was another שֵׁשׁ meaning 'white marble' (Cant. v. 15, Esth. i. 6; cp. שִׁישׁ, 1 Chr. xxix. 2). From our point of view, however, שֵׁשׁ (or שִׁישׁ), with which cp. שֵׁשַׁי (Num. xiii. 22), שֵׁשָׁן (1 Chr. ii. 31), שִׁישָׁא (1 K. iv. 3), יִשִׁישַׁי (1 Chr. v. 14), is a popular distortion of אשור (cp. סיסרא, also from אשור). Thus אבני שיש in 1 Chr. xxix. 2 means, not 'white marble stones,' but 'Asshur-stones,' and בגדי שֵׁשׁ in our passage (Gen. xli. 42) means 'garments of Asshur-stuff.' For the latter, cp. בגדי השרד (Ex. xxxi. 10, etc.) and ב׳ הקדש, both corruptions of ב׳ אשחר; also אדרת שנער, Josh. vii. 21. Another fine textile fabric (hardly silk) was משי (combined with שש in Ezek. xvi. 10, 13); now משי, according to numerous analogies, has possibly come from ישמעאל. Note also the combination, in Prov. xxxi. 22, of שש and ארגמן, and in Esth. i. 6, viii. 15,[2] of בוץ and ארגמן; now purple stuffs (ארגמן) came from ישמעאל = אלישה (Ezek. xxvii. 7), and in Isa. xix. 9 the troublesome שְׂרִיקוֹת has doubtless arisen out of אשחורי, which is a gloss correcting חורי; וארגים should be וארגמן, so that 'Asshurite purple' is a second accusative to עבדי in *v.* 9 *a*.

For the sake of completeness I venture to point out that בוץ, the synonym of שֵׁשׁ, must, according to analogies, have arisen out of צבעון, a clear development of ישמעאל (see on xxxvi. 14). From Ezek. xxvii. 16 one might infer that this was the name given to the fine linen which came from Aram (*i.e.* the southern Aram), while שֵׁשׁ was the name given to that which came from Miṣrim.

The conclusion is obvious. There is no reason why בגדי שֵׁשׁ in the passage before us should be supposed to point to Egypt as the scene of the story of Joseph. On the contrary, it points distinctly to Arabia.

There is, no doubt, one remarkable omission in the description of Joseph's state dress. We have seen that in Egypt בגדי־שש did not constitute an exceptional dress. But there was something else which, though not in later times exclusively royal, yet in the age in which Joseph

[1] See W. M. M., *E. Bib.*, 'Egypt,' § 35.
[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Purple.'

would be assumed to have lived, and in that of the narrators, would have indicated at any rate a share of regal authority —and that is a purple mantle. Both as the royal deputy and as an adopted member of a priestly family, Joseph could not have been without a purple robe. It *is* no doubt omitted in our text, but surely by accident. It is true, the insertion of it would not strengthen the case for Egypt. For in the story of Daniel (v. 7) we find Belshazzar promising that the reader of the writing on the wall should be clothed in purple; in that of Zerubbabel (1 Esdr. iii. 6) Darius makes the same promise, and adds a head-tire of fine linen; and in that of Esther (viii. 15), Mordecai wears a crown of gold and a mantle of fine linen (בוץ) and purple; cp. also 1 Macc. x. 20, 62, 64, and other passages. Now, as has been shown above, purple was reckoned as one of the commodities of Arabia; it was doubtless a Tyrian product, but it was also Arabian.

Nor does the presentation of a golden collar to a royal favourite prove the scenery to be Egyptian. It was certainly a highly-prized Egyptian decoration[1] (like the insignia of our orders), but it was also Persian (Herod. iii. 20; Xen. *Anab.* i. 2, 27), and other countries doubtless had it too.

Definitely un-Egyptian phrases follow. 'In the second chariot' (*v.* 43) has been shown already to be corrupt. It was the king's own chariot (אשר לו) in which Joseph rode, and the chariot was of the type called 'chariot of Ishmael.'[2] So, too, the words 'and they cried before him, Abrek'—which have been made to mean almost anything and everything[3]—are also corrupt, and can only be plausibly and defensibly corrected if the N. Arabian theory be accepted. In seeking for a correction we have simply to let ourselves be guided by analogies. אברך belongs, in fact, to one of the most numerously attested types of corruption. Just as

[1] See *E. Bib.*, col. 2590 ('Joseph,' § 5, Egyptian parallels).

[2] For another view see *E. Bib.*, col. 2590.

[3] The least unplausible of the many interpretations is that אברך is the Ass. *abarakku*, the title of a very high dignitary, which, like so many other Asiatic words, may conceivably have passed into Egypt (see *E. Bib.*, 'Abrech,' where *abarakku* is favoured; 'Joseph,' § 6, where another correction, but one less supported by analogy, is offered). The Egyptological explanations continue to multiply.

אברם and אברהם come from ערב־ארם and ערב־ירחם respectively (cp. on xvii. 5), and חדרך from חדד־רקם (p. 92; Zech. ix. 1), so אברך cannot fail to represent ערב־רקם, *i.e.* ערב־ירחם, 'Yarḥamite Arabia.' It is true this conclusion does not fit in with the preceding words ויקראו לפניו. But can it be affirmed that a proclamation of any kind is suitable in the context? Joseph has been told previously that he shall be the second in the kingdom, and that all the people shall bow down to him (*v.* 40). Has not the right moment come for this act of submission to be carried out? The new vizier has been presented in royal state to the people; what ought to follow? Surely that the people prostrated themselves. By a very small and regular emendation we can obtain the required sense. ויקראו is manifestly wrong, and ויכרעו as manifestly right. The words ויכ' לפניו ought surely to be joined on to כל־ארץ מצרים (here a collective term for the Miṣrite people). The intervening words אברך ונתון אתו על have most probably come from ערב־רקם הוא נתין ישמעאל, 'Arabia of Reḳem, that is, Nathin-Ishmael.'[1] Here ערב רקם is a gloss on כל־ארץ מצ'; it informs us that by 'all the land of Miṣrim' is meant the region otherwise known as Arab-Reḳem or Nathin-Ishmael. The existence of an ethnic Nethinim, most probably related to Ethan and Ethanim, has already been pointed out (*Amer. Journ. of Theol.* v. [1901], p. 440; cp. on Neh. iii. 26). A clan of Nethinim was closely connected with the temple-service, and showed remarkable eagerness to return to Jerusalem (see on Ezra viii. 17, 20). The Book of Jubilees (xl. 7, Charles) has, according to the Ethiopic, El Elwa Abîrer, or, according to the Latin, Elel et Habirel, where El El or Elel seems to represent ירחמאל and Abîrer or Habirel ערב ירח'. At any rate, there is no explanation of these readings which is as capable of critical defence. Thus the Book of Jubilees contributes to the support of a view of Miṣrim already forced upon us by the phenomena of the traditional text

[1] For another text-critical view see Cheyne, *Orient. Lit.-ztg.*, 1900, col. 152; but cp. W. M. Müller, *ibid.* col. 325. It was at any rate worth while to point out that אברך still needed explanation, and that the words ונתון אתו על כל־ארץ מצ' were quite impossible where they stand. Cp. Ball's suggestion in *SBOT*, which, however, is not satisfactory.

of the O.T. On the significance of the N. Arabian tribe-name 'Ethan,' see 1 K. iv. 31 and *Crit. Bib. ad loc.*, and cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Ethan.'

To rise to a position of high importance in Egypt would necessarily involve, for a foreigner like Joseph, the adoption of a courtly Egyptian name.[1] Hence the question, Can the name Ṣāphenath-paʿneaḥ be satisfactorily explained from Egyptian? To prove that it can be so explained need not, of course, imply that the scene of the original Joseph-story was laid in Egypt; the mention of Joseph's new name might be due to a later editor. But it is, at any rate, an interesting question to raise, for, in the event of there being no very good Egyptian explanation, it will be our duty to open another question, viz. whether this compound name can be explained, in accordance with analogies, on the N. Arabian theory.

Many and varied are the explanations of Ṣāphenath-paʿneaḥ (xli. 45) derived from the truly ample sources of Egyptology (see *E. Bib.*, col. 5379). According to Crum in Hastings' *DB*, p. 665 *b*, the only transcription which conforms to Egyptian grammar and usage is *jephnoute'fonch*, 'God speaks and he lives.' This is due to Steindorff (*ZA* xxvii. 42). Erman, however, interprets 'member of the college of hierogrammatists,' and similarly Naville, by altering one letter, 'head of the college,' etc. (*PSBA*, 1903, pp. 157-161). Objections to Steindorff's view are urged by Lieblein (*PSBA*, 1898, pp. 202 *ff.*). J. Marquart's view[2] is in some respects more, in others less plausible. The decisive objection is that it makes Joseph a co-religionist and official of Amen-ḥotep IV., who so fanatically promoted the worship of the god of the solar disk, Iten. This is as difficult a view as that of Winckler respecting the religious propaganda made by Abraham (cp. p. 225), and is also opposed by those very numerous textual phenomena which

[1] See Heyes, pp. 256 *ff.*

[2] *Philologus*, vii. 676 *f.*; cp. *E. Bib.*, col. 5379, where, too, the present writer's earlier explanation of the text-reading will be found, and *OLZ*, April and Oct. 1900 (on Joseph's name). On 𝔊's reading see Nestle, 'Miscellen,' *ZATW*, 1905, Heft 1. His suggestion (to transpose ϛ and ϩ) is most unfortunate.

point to N. Arabia. Our present point of view enables us to propose a theory which accords with a large number of phenomena recognised elsewhere. Ṣāphenath-paʿneaḥ ought to be a compound geographical name, like Poṭi-phera' (= Puṭ-ʿărāb), Ab-raham (= Arab-Yarḥam), Ab-šalom (= Arab-Ishmael), etc. Looking at the first element צפנת, it may possibly be a modification of צרפת, produced under the influence of אסנת; Ṣarephath was the name of an important place or district in N. Arabia (cp. on x. 14). It is simpler, however, to regard צפנת as a feminine form[1] of צפון, a name which we meet with in Jer. i. 14 and elsewhere as that of the region from which an invasion might be anticipated, and in Isa. xiv. 13 as that of the district where, for the king styled 'Yerahmeel, son of Ashḥur,'[2] was the sacred mountain of his race (cp. p. 50, note 3). It is also found in Judg. xii. 1 as the name of a Gadite city. Without doubt it is a modification of צבעון (see on xxxvi. 14), *i.e.* ישמעאל. As to פענח, it has been suggested[3] that it is probably a corruption of פנחס or פינחס, which in Ex. vi. 25 is the name of the son of Eleazar, son of Aaron, by one of the 'daughters of Puṭiel.' The name Puṭiel cannot be unconnected with Poṭi-phera'; and just as the former name occurs in the genealogy of Phinehas, grandson of Aaron, so the latter occurs in that of Manasseh and Ephraim, sons of Joseph (xli. 50-52). Both Aaron and Joseph, then, were traditionally connected with a region called פנחס, and from Josh. xxiv. 33 we may gather that it was in the highlands of Ephraim. But where were those highlands? Perhaps Josh. xvi. 1, xvii. 15, xix. 50, xx. 7, Judg. iv. 5 may help us. From (*a*) we learn that one boundary of the original territory of the Joseph-tribe was the Yarḥon (ירדן is followed by the correction ירחו, *i.e.* ירחו'); from (*b*), that the original highland of Ephraim was in the same zone as the land of the Perizzites (= Zarephathites?) and the Rephaim (= 'Arbim); from (*c*), that it included Timnath-seraḥ (= Timnath of Ashḥur), where Joshua was held to have been buried; from (*d*), that one of its cities was Shechem (= Shakram, *i.e.* Ashḥur-

[1] Cp. Bekorath (1 S. ix. 1), Harosheth (Judg. iv. 2), Shelomith (Ezra viii. 10). [2] In MT. given as הילל בן־שחר (*v.* 12).

[3] See *E. Bib.*, 'Phinehas,' § 1; 'Zaphnath-paaneah.

Aram). Putting these results together, we may venture to hold that the original har-Ephraim[1] was in the N. Arabian border-land, and consequently that here, too, lay פינחס and its hill (Josh. xxiv. 33).

Joseph, therefore, was most probably connected with a district called Pîneḥas or Pinḥas in Ṣāphenath, *i.e.* Ishmael, or more precisely in the N. Arabian Ephraim.[2] Now as to the origin of the name. Such a form as Pîneḥas looks very outlandish; many therefore take it to be Egyptian,[3] and explain as 'the negro (or dark-skinned).' It is, however, not a whit stranger than רמשק (see on xv. 2); indeed, the second part of that name (slightly disguised in MT. as דמשק) will help us here. For again and again שק and similar forms are fragments of corrupt forms of אשחר; among these forms is חס, which plainly comes from חרס (=אשחר); see Judg. i. 35, viii. 13; also 1 K. iv. 10 (בן־חסד from בן־חרס). As for the first part, פן is probably more correct than פין; it is probably a fragment of נפתח (Nephtōah?). The reason for this is (1) that נפתח has a tendency to get corrupted (cp. on פחת מואב, Ezra ii. 6, viii. 4, etc.; נפת דור, Josh. xii. 23), and (2) that we have one place-name in which נפתח, written backwards, is prefixed to חס (=אשחר), viz. תחפנחס, Jer. xliii. 7, etc., which in Isa. xxx. 4 has become חנס.[4] Thus the name misread as Ṣāphenath-paʿneaḥ points to the fact that the Joseph-tribe originated in Ashḥur-Ishmael, and more particularly in that part which was known as Naphtaḥ or Nephtōaḥ.

The traditional name of Joseph's wife—the mother of Manasseh and Ephraim—is also recorded. It was אסנת, which Steindorff and Spiegelberg explain 'belonging to (the Saite goddess) Neith,'[5] in which case the editor is as late as

[1] The later 'har-Ephraim,' of course, lay in central Palestine.

[2] Cp. Am. v. 6, 15, vi. 6, Ps. lxxviii. 67, where 'Joseph'= 'Ephraim.'

[3] See W. M. Müller, *E. Bib.*, 'Phinehas,' § 2.

[4] The apparent dogmatism only means that these Genesis researches have been preceded by similar inquiries into other O.T. books, which have not been without assured results.

[5] Neith is a manifestation of Isis. Cp. ניעמן, supposed to be pronounced Neiṭman, *i.e.* the goddess Neith (Cooke, p. 146). But נ is prefixed by a lapse; the name is really יעמן, *i.e.* יתמען (=ישמעאל).

the twenty-sixth dynasty (Saite). But, as Naville remarks, the cult of the goddess of Sais was quite different from that of the deity of On or Heliopolis. It should also be noticed that in Ezra ii. 50 the people called בני אסנה are one of the families of the Nethinim (or Ethanites; see on נתון, *v.* 43), and that they are grouped with the benê Meunim and the benê Nephisim. The two latter names point one to N. Arabia (for the latter see on xxv. 15). In fact, אסנת simply means 'Ishmaelitess.' It is a member of a large group of forms corrupted from ישמעאל. The nearest of these to אסנת is סאון (סאן) in Isa. ix. 4, which has nothing to do with military boots,[1] but designates some branch of Ishmael as the enemy to be overcome. Other allied forms are סונה, Ezek. xxix. 10 (a place on the border of Miṣrim); סין, Ex. xvi. 1, cp. Ezek. xvi. 1, cp. xxx. 15 *f.*; סינים, Isa. xlix. 12; שאן in בית שאן, Josh. xvii. 11; אשען, Josh. xv. 52; אשנה, Josh. xv. 33, 43. All these forms come from שמען or שמאן, *i.e.* ישמעאל.

But, it may be objected, was not Asenath the daughter of Poṭi-phera', priest of On? True; but we cannot say that 'On' must have meant the Egyptian Heliopolis.[2] Are Ben-oni (xxxv. 18) and Onan (xxxviii. 4) Egyptian names? Was the 'plain of Ono' (Neh. vi. 2) in Egypt? And so we might go on, showing the highly problematical character of the traditional hypothesis. See further on xxxv. 18, Num. xvi. 1, Josh. vii. 2, where the wide dissemination of 'On' and parallel forms in N. Arabia is shown. For Poṭi-phera', see on 'Potiphar,' xxxvii. 36.

The puzzling words at the end of *v.* 45 are another version of *v.* 46 *b*, misplaced (על perhaps from כל).

If 'Joseph' is really the eponym of an Asaphite clan (xxx. 24), and specially connected with the Naphtahite portion of the Ishmaelite or Yeraḥme'elite border-land (*v.* 45), we shall not have to grope after an explanation of Menasseh and Ephraim. The guess[3] that שה in מנשה represents שא,

[1] There is much corruption in the passage. Why refer to boots at all? רעש, like ראש in xlvi. 21, Ezek. xxxviii. 2, Hab. iii. 13, comes from אשר.

[2] There is a difference between 'must' and 'may.' For 'may' see W. M. Müller, *Zt. f. Aeg. Spr.*, 1892, p. 61 (Heliopolis, *i'wn*, i.e. *'own*).

[3] See Wellh. *Heid.*(1) p. 62; Cook, *Exp. Times*, x. 525 *f.*; Hogg,

and that שא is a divine name, also found in בעשא, and that מנ is a shortened form of מני,[1] the god of fortune (Isa. lxv. 11), is as wide of the mark as the explanation 'one who injures the hip-sinew' (Land; see on xxxii. 33). The vocalisation of MT. is no doubt a stumbling-block; it is so alike to those who hold the N. Arabian theory, and to those who discover in מנשה the two divine names Men and Sha. But this vocalisation may not have been universal in ancient times. It is true that Esarhaddon gives the name of king Menasseh of Judah as Mi-na-si-i, but in the parallel list of kings Ašurbanipal gives it as Mi-in-si-i (= מנשי). This at once reminds us[2] of 'Jehu, son of Nimshi' (2 K. ix. 20), where 'Nimshi' is a corruption of 'Ishmael,' like 'Nimrim' (Isa. xv. 6) for 'Rimmonim' or the like. Cp. also שמן and שנם, משנה (*v.* 43) and משנים (Ezra i. 10). Menasseh, therefore, is a distortion of Minshi = Ishman = Ishmael.

As to 'Ephraim,' it is remarkable that the moderns so generally accept the narrator's connexion of the name with הִפְרָה, as if 'fertile tract,' while they reject the connexion of מנשה with נִשָּׁה, 'to cause to forget.' We have a right, however, to expect the name to have sprung from some ethnic or place-name. The nearest ethnic (Palestinian or N. Arabian) to 'Ephraim' is 'Rephaim'; but we have no evidence that 'Rephaim' is older or more original than 'Ephraim'; all that we can say is that they may be presumed to have the same origin. Passing over the two suggestions mentioned by Prof. Hogg[3] as unsuitable, we may remind ourselves of the cases (see on 'Arpakshad,' x. 22) in which פרא and ארפ have most probably come from עֵרֶב, and on the ground of which we have already (on xiv. 5) derived רפאים from ערבים, 'Arabians' or 'Arabia.' It would seem that just as the same word for 'to make' is pronounced *episu* in Assyrian and *ebisu* in Babylonian, so in parts of the N. Arabian region from which the Israelites came עֵרֶב may

E. Bib., cols. 2291, 2921. The theory is untenable. Abishai and Baasha represent different types of corruption from the same original, which is Arab-Ishmael; Amasa and Amasai both spring from Ishmael.

[1] Really מני in Isa. *l.c.* comes from ימן = ירחמאל (cp. on 'Javan,' x. 3).

[2] Cp. Hogg, *E. Bib.*, col. 2921 (top).

[3] *E. Bib.*, 'Ephraim,' § 5.

have been pronounced עֶרֶף, whence came עֵפֶר (xxv. 4), אפרת, אפרים, רפאים. That there was an Ephraimite dialect we know from Judg. xii. 6 (the southern, not the northern Ephraim, is referred to). A word may be said (1) as to the traditional termination יִם, and (2) as to the relation of 'Ephraim' to 'Menasseh.' As to the first point, we may admit the improbability of the dual termination, and hold that either *-aim* should be *-ām*, or else the final letters ים represent a distinct word, viz. יָם, shortened from ימן.[1] As to the second, it is possible, as Prof. Hogg remarks,[2] that the attempt of an early writer to mark out a geographical boundary for Ephraim is rather arbitrary, and suppose that the whole highland country was 'Ephraimite,' and only certain towns specially 'Menassite.' To this one may add that the full name of the highland country may have been ערב ישמעאל, 'Ishmaelite Arabia,' where ערב will correspond to אפרים and ישמ׳ to מנשה. So that the question as to the relative position of Ephraim and Menasseh may be purely artificial.

JACOB'S TEN SONS IN MIṢRIM (GEN. XLII.)

THE brethren 'go down' to Miṣrim. One alone would not have been able to bring back enough corn. 'But Benjamin, Joseph's brother, Jacob sent not with his brethren.' The reason is well given by Judah in xliv. 20, 'his brother is dead, and he alone is left of his mother, and his father loveth him'—such favouritism was not repugnant to the

[1] Hommel has already analysed אפרים into אפר ים, but without noticing that in this case ים (ים׳) will represent ימן (see on xiv. 3).

[2] *E. Bib.*, 'Ephraim,' § 5.

ancients. Indeed, as he himself allows us to see (*v.* 38), Jacob will run any risk rather than lose Benjamin. So only the ten go; like the others, they do obeisance to the *shalliṭ* (viceroy?) who in this naively conceived narrative sells the corn himself. Thus Joseph's early dreams begin to be fulfilled (*v.* 9; cp. xliii. 26, 28, xlvii. 31). The brethren, however, are still unconscious of this. Joseph is now a man, and in appearance a Miṣrite. His suspicious and arbitrary treatment of the little band of Hebrews is in accordance with Oriental manners in all ages; he also wishes to stir the torpid consciences of the brethren, for, in his own opinion, he is a messenger of God (xlv. 5, 7 *f.*), and he is reputed to have a gift of divination (xliv. 5). The issue is that Simeon is left behind in Miṣrim bound,[1] as a guarantee that Benjamin will be brought later. Observe that, as in xxxvii. 22, Reuben takes the precedence (*vv.* 22, 37); the statement in xxxv. 22 (see note) is a late distortion of the old tradition of Reuben, who was more sinned against than sinning. The brethren find their money in the sacks, restored. A fresh fear besets them, and a fresh sense of bereavement overpowers their father.

In the last generation some English writers supposed that a pictorial record had been found of the first meeting of Joseph and his brethren. In truth, on the north wall of the tomb of prince Chnem-ḥotep on the height of Beni Hasan[2] is a picture of the interview of thirty-seven Asiatics with the Egyptian prince-governor. It is not, however, hunger but trade that brings them to Egypt. They are nomads from Arabia, led by their prince Absha, and they bring, not honey and spices (xliii. 11), but stibium or eye-paint. 'Absha' is most probably = Abshai (*i.e.* Arab-shur) or Abshua (= 'Arab-sheba). For בֹּר (*v.* 3) read שֶׁבֶר with Lagarde. שַׁלִּיט (*v.* 6) is perhaps due to the latest redactor (*BDB*, after Kuenen). In *v.* 38 שְׁאוֹל is a very old corruption of שמאול = ישמעאל. 'Ishmael' (= 'Yerahme'el) was

[1] Winckler finds a mythological (zodiacal) substratum, which in fact is possible (*AOF* xxi. 459).

[2] The tombs of Beni Hasan are of the twelfth dynasty. See *Archæol. Survey of Egypt*, part i. p. 69; and cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Egypt,' § 50; 'Joseph,' § 8; 'Music,' § 8.

in one of his aspects the god of the underworld. For the not inconsiderable evidence, see pp. 53 *f*. In *v*. 18 note that Joseph (supposed to be a Miṣrite) agrees fundamentally in religion with the brethren.

JACOB SENDS BENJAMIN (GEN. XLIII.)

THE second meeting of the brethren, including Benjamin, with Joseph. Note the account of the present, which appears to be made up of things rare and therefore costly in Miṣrim. Cp. Ezek. xxvii. 17, where for 'the land of Israel' read 'the land of Ishmael'; and for 'wheat of Minnith, and Pannag, and honey' (so A.V.), read 'wheat of Maacath (מעכת) and grape-honey[1] (ודבש גפן).' Jacob is now in Canaan, but the land of Yerahme'el, in the larger sense of the word, included both Miṣrim and Canaan (x. 6). Note also Jacob's prayer (*v*. 14). He assumes that El-Shaddai, *i.e.* El-Asshur (see on xvii. 1), has power in Miṣrim. On the arrival of the Hebrews, after the transaction of business, Joseph entertains them. There are three separate tables, one for the great noble or grand vizier, another for the Miṣrites in general, and a third for the Hebrews. In *v*. 32 (cp. xlvi. 34), the narrator may seem to have introduced a feature which implies that the Miṣrites are Egyptians. But let us not be too sure. The N. Arabian Miṣrites were more advanced in culture than the Hebrews, who were still in the pastoral stage. This will account for the statement referred to (see above, p. 458).

[1] The modern *dibs*. Cp. Bliss, *A Mound of Many Cities*, pp. 69-71.

JOSEPH'S POLICY TOWARDS THE BRETHREN (GEN. XLIV.)

WITH wonderful self-restraint Joseph continues to exercise his functions as the elect agent of Providence. One trial more is needed to melt the hard hearts of his brethren. Joseph's divining bowl (divination flourished in other countries besides Egypt) is put into Benjamin's sack. In hot haste, as if just aware of the theft, the steward of the vizier recalls them, and they are brought before Joseph. Judah, who now takes the precedence (cp. xliii. 3, 8), attempts no excuse, and accepts the doom of servitude for himself and his brethren. This strange misfortune must be the punishment of some unknown sin; 'God has found out the iniquity of thy servants' (*v.* 16). Joseph, however, refuses to punish any one but the person with whom the bowl was found. A torturing moment has come; the brothers feel for Benjamin as they ought formerly to have felt for Joseph. Judah makes a truly great speech, and entreats to be allowed to become Benjamin's substitute (*vv.* 32, 33).

The text has one strange peculiarity; the interpolation of the returned money (*v.* 1 *b* and 2 *a* part). How strange, if the present text be correct, that the steward makes no mention of the corn-money on opening the sacks (*v.* 12)! Joseph's bowl, or goblet, is of much interest. 𝔊 renders in *v.* 2 *τὸ κονδυ τὸ ἀργυροῦν*; the word *κ.* also occurs in 𝔊 at Isa. li. 17, 22. Note that *κονδυ* is not a native Egyptian word. Athenæus (xi. 55) defines it as *ποτήριον Ἀσιατικόν*, Nicomachus (ap. Athen.) as Persian, Pollux (vi. 96) as Cappadocian. The opinion of Nicomachus seems to be correct.[1] Kandû or Kundû is translated by Vullers 'vas

[1] So the late Prof. Aufrecht, in a private letter.

figlinum frumento recondendo.' A friend, a native of Cumberland, informs me that in that county it used to be common to tell fortunes from the grounds of a tea-cup. The magic mirror of ink in modern Egypt is familiar (Lane, *Mod. Egypt*, i. 337 *ff.*). I presume that a similar divining process was known in the N. Arabia of the Israelitish period. At any rate, the vessels of the 'house of Yahweh' included 'silver bowls of the Ishmaelites' (Ezra i. 10; see p. 452, note 2). Joseph's bowl (גביע ; Ezra has כפור), too, was both Ishmaelitish (N. Arabian), and, by its use, sacred. See further Hunger, 'Becherwahrsagung bei den Babyloniern,' in the Leipzig collection of studies called *Semit. Studien*, 1903.—Note by the way that in *v.* 4 the name of the city is not mentioned (cp. Driver on xlvi. 31).

RECONCILIATION AND INVITATION
(GEN. XLV. 1-24)

THE speech of Judah brings about a crisis. It has convinced Joseph that the selfishness of his brothers has been broken down, and that he can afford to throw off his disguise and give free vent to his feelings. Gently he relieves the mind of his brothers, and lifts them up to the height of God's purpose. 'It was not you that sent me hither, but God' (*v.* 8). He sends a loving message to his father by the brothers, and promises him and them a dwelling near himself in 'the land of Goshen' (J). Another source (E) states that the invitation came from the king, and describes the generous presents, laden with which the brethren departed on their way. The only detail on which we need pause is the arrangement for Jacob's settlement in 'the land of Goshen' (*v.* 10), the notice of which is due to

the Yahwist (J). It is usual to suppose that the district referred to was within the boundaries of Egypt. It is remarkable, however, that in xlv. 10 𝔊 gives, for the 'Goshen' of MT., Γεσεμ Ἀραβίας (cp. xlvi. 34, ἐν γῇ Γεσεμ Ἀραβίᾳ; but in xlvii. 1, ἐν γῇ Γεσεμ).[1] This has been illustrated by the fact that in the Græco-Roman period Ἀραβία was one of the twenty-three nomes into which the Delta region was divided; its capital was Φακοῦσσα. According to W. M. Müller the Ἀραβία of 𝔊 is not the Arabian nome, but a more eastern part of the Arabian *district*—the Wâdy eṭ-Ṭumilât and its western vicinity east of Bubastus. 'Goshen,' in his opinion, represents a rare Egyptian name (Ḳsm) for the twentieth or western nome.[2] Similarly writes Spiegelberg,[3] who adds, however, that whether the older Hebrew sources (J and E) thought of this district cannot be proved with certainty, and that the later source (P) placed the seats of the Israelites in the 'land of Ramses,' the present Wâdy eṭ-Ṭumilât. Such are the conjectures which at present appear to find the most favour.[4]

Let us now see what can be said for the N. Arabian theory. First, as to the Ἀραβίας appended by 𝔊 to Γεσεμ, it seems to me a plausible view that it represents an original reading עֶרֶב. 'Arabian Goshen' is not a whit more peculiar than 'Arabian Ḳerith (or Ashḥoreth') in xxiii. 2 (see note) and elsewhere. The addition of עֶרֶב may have been simply intended to distinguish this from any other Goshen. And now as to 'Goshen' (גֹּשֶׁן). There are four reasons why it is unwise to connect the name with the Egyptian Ḳsm, viz. (1) that though *ḳ* = *g* in the transcriptions is quite regular, *s* = ש is not regular; (2) that the name Ḳsm is rarely found;[5] (3) that P does not use the name גשן, and yet can hardly be supposed to mean a different region from J and E; and (4) that the same name (גשן) is given in Josh. x. 41, xi. 16 (𝔊 γῆν Γοσομ), to a district in the region stated to

[1] Quite otherwise in xlvi. 28 (see note).

[2] *E. Bib.*, 'Goshen,' § 2.

[3] *Der Aufenthalt Israels in Aegypten* (1904), p. 52.

[4] Jensen, however (*Gilg.-epos*, p. 152, note 4), thinks that our Goshen is = the Goshen in S. Palestine.

[5] (1) and (2) are derived from W. M. Müller.

have been conquered by Joshua, and in Josh. xv. 51 to a city in the 'mountains' of Judah. As Müller admits, it is plausible under the circumstances to seek for a 'Semitic or at least non-Egyptian origin' of the name. Certainly; but it will be vain to search any of the lexicons for the root. The key to גשן is in the גישן of 1 Chr. ii. 47, which is a Calebite, *i.e.* N. Arabian name, and stands beside פלט (cp. 'Peleth,' *v.* 33) and not far from רגם (=ירחם). Like גשם (Neh. ii. 19) and גשמו (Neh. ii. 6), it is a worn-down form of גרשם;[1] indeed, 𝔊[A] actually gives *γηρσωμ*. What, then, is גרש, which is the essential part of the original name? Like גשור, and like גרז in גרזים, it is but a variety of אַשְׁחֻר. The names Gershon (xlvi. 11), Gershom (Ex. ii. 22), simply indicate that the tribe or (it might be) district which bears it belongs to the great body of Ashḥurite clans or to the great region known as Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el. And since in a wide sense the land of Miṣrim was a part of Yeraḥme'el, and again in a narrower sense distinct from it, it is conceivable that Goshen (=Gershon) might be described either as within or without the region commonly known as Miṣṣor or Miṣrim.

We are now able to consider the suggestion of Hugo Winckler,[2] adopted by his faithful follower A. Jeremias,[3] that the reference to 'Goshen' in Josh. x. 41, xi. 16, is interpolated, and that the interpolation is due to a learned reader who 'knew' that 'Goshen' and 'Yarmuth' were equivalent, and that the 'Yarmuth' spoken of in Josh. x. was the 'Yarimuta' of the Amarna letters, which was the centre of a great corn district, and whose governor was Yanḥamu (see p. 115, note 3). It is no doubt obvious that 'all the land of Goshen' in x. 41 is misplaced; and it may well be a gloss on some part of the specification in *v.* 40. But it is surely gratuitous to suppose that it is equivalent to 'the land of Yarmuth.' It is probable that there were several Yarmuths, for the word is simply a modification of Yarḥam.[4] In Josh. x. 3 Yarmuth is mentioned between Hebron and Lachish;

[1] This is surely better than Nöldeke's derivation from the Arabic (*ǵushamu*, 'stout'). Cp. Sinaitic נשמו, גרמו, and גרשו.

[2] *AOF* iii. 215.

[3] *ATAO*, p. 246, note 2.

[4] See *E. Bib.*, 'Jerimoth.'

in xv. 35 with Adullam and Socoh. This 'Yarmuth' is clearly distinct from the place referred to in *v.* 51 as Goshen, and there is no sufficient reason to suppose that it was the 'Yarimuta' of the Tell el-Amarna letters,[1] or the 'Goshen' of the Joseph-story in Genesis. There may also, of course, have been several Goshens or Gershons.

JACOB STARTS FOR MIṢRIM
(GEN. XLV. 25-XLVI. 1-5)

JACOB hears the good news of Joseph, and determines to transfer himself and his family to Miṣrim. He is not, however, free from anxiety, and therefore offers sacrifices at the sanctuary of Beer-sheba, where Isaac had already built an altar (xxvi. 25), and Abraham had planted a sacred tree (xxi. 33; see note). The next question that arises is a religious one. By what title did Jacob address the divinity of the place or region? The text has לאלהי אביו יצחק, 'to the god of his father Isaac.' But we must regard this in the light of the results gained by a study of xxvi. 24, xxviii. 13, xxxi. 42, 53. In the very instructive account of the journey of Abraham's servant there is a good reason for describing Yahweh as the God of Abraham (xxiv. 12, 27); the speaker owes his religious standing entirely to his master Abraham; he is also the patriarch's representative in his quest for a wife for Isaac. Here, however, there is no sufficient reason for the phrase 'the god of his father Isaac,' for as soon as Jacob had reached the suitable age he could claim the protection of

[1] This Yarimuta was, according to Marquart, in the Fayyūm, a natural depression in the Libyan hills; according to C. Niebuhr however, nearer to Palestine, in the east of the Delta.

the tribal or family god in his own right. We should therefore read in *v.* 1 (as in the parallels) that Jacob sacrificed to the God of Ashḥurite Arabia (עֲרַב אַשְׁחֹר). It may be noticed that in xlix. 25 (revised text) we find the blessing of 'the God of Asshur' invoked by Jacob upon Joseph.

JACOB'S FAMILY (GEN. XLVI. 6-27)

P's very precise account (note 'daughters' and 'sons' daughters') of the migration of Jacob into Miṣrim, followed by a list of his descendants (see Driver's note, p. 365), which has evidently passed through various phases. Here we have only to consider the significance of the names. The results will confirm the view that the personages of the patriarchal legend are of N. Arabian origin. For 'Jacob' see on xxv. 26; for Jacob's sons, on xxix. 31-xxx. 24, xxxv. 18. (*a*) Reuben. 1. That חנוך should be variously described as a Reubenite and (xxv. 4) a Midianite is not surprising, for the Reubenites occupied Midianite country (Josh. xiii. 21, PR), and Ḥănōk is a pre-Israelite N. Arabian name (see on v. 17) where Ḥănōk is the son of Ḳain = Kenites).—2. פלוא is a difficult name; it may, however, be connected with פלת (cp. Num. xvi. 1, xxvi. 8).—3. חצרון (cp. *v.* 12). From חצר, a very early distortion of אשחר. Cp. צחר, Ezek. xxvii. 18 (regional name); also xxiii. 8 (personal name); and זרח, xxxviii. 30.—4. כרמי, from רקמי = ירחמי (cp. on קדם, x. 30, xxix. 1). No wonder that such a name should also be Judahite.

(*b*) Simeon. 1. 2. ימואל and ימין, both from ירחמאל. Cp. on xxxv. 18 (ימין), Num. xxvi. 12 (נמואל).—3. אֹהַד; cp. אֵהוּד, Judg. iii. 15, and הוד, 1 Chr. vii. 37. Perhaps from

אבי־הדד, *i.e.* ערב־ה', 'Arabia of Hadad.'—4. יכין, probably from ירחמאל = יכמן. See on 1 K. vii. 21.—5. צחר. See on (*a*), 3.—6. שאול. See on xxxvi. 37.

(*c*) Levi. 1. גרשון. See on 'Goshen,' xlv. 10; 'Gershom,' Ex. ii. 22.—2. קהת. Probably to be grouped with יקתאל (Josh. xv. 38), יקותיאל (1 Chr. iv. 18), יקטן (x. 25).—3. מרדי. Gesenius, 'bitter, unhealthy.' Rather, like מרים, ממרא, etc., a popular development of דם = ארם.

(*d*) Yehudah. 1-5. See on chap. xxxviii.—6. חצרון. See (*a*) 3.—7. חמול. Cp. on מחול, 1 K. v. 11; חמואל, 1 Chr. iv. 26.

(*e*) Issachar. 1. תולע. Probably from אשתאול = אשתאמל = אשתר ירחמ', 'Ashtar-Yerahme'el.' See on iv. 25, and *E. Bib.*, 'Tola.'—2. פֻּוָּה. See on פועה, Ex. i. 15; פואה, Judg. x. 1.—3. יוב. Rather ישוב, as Num. xxvi. 24, 1 Chr. vii. 1; so Sam., 𝔊. Winckler (*GI* ii. 68, note 3) connects Heb. *yāshūb* with the personal name Yašub-ilu (1st Babylonian dynasty). But what is Yašub-ilu? Surely a modification of Yišma"el. Cp. ישב and יבש, often from ישמ'. The name was originally non-religious.—4. שמרון. שמר is a widely-spread clan-name; cp. שמרי, שמרת, שמריהו, ישמרי. A certain Moabitess was called שמרית (2 Chr. xxiv. 26), while Shimri (1 Chr. iv. 37) is a Simeonite. The Shimron of Josh. xi. 1, and perhaps even the שמרון of Kings and the שמרין of Ezra, are N. Arabian place-names.

(*f*) Zebulun. 1. סרד. Obscure.—2. אלון = אילון (Judg. xii. 11), from יאלון, where יאל, presumably, represents ירחמאל.—So also does 3. יחלאל. Cp. יהללאל, 1 Chr. iv. 16; the benê Yehal. come after the benê Kaleb. Also מהללאל, v. 12. See *E. Bib.*, 'Jahleel.'

(*g*) Gad. 1. צפיון, in Num. xxvi. 15 צפון; so Sam., 𝔊. From צבעון; see on xxxvi. 20, and cp. on צפנת, xli. 45.—2. חגי. חג a widely-spread clan-name. Cp. חַגַּי, Hag. i. 1; חַגִּיָּה, 1 Chr. vi. 30; חַגִּית, 2 S. iii. 4. In 1 Chr. ii. 45 *f.* the benê Ḥagabah and the benê Ḥagab are mentioned among names plainly N. Arabian. Is Ḥagab a fuller form of the name? Phœn. חגי, חגת; Palm. חגגו (Cooke, p. 276).—3. שוני. See on 'Shunem,' 1 S. xxviii. 4.—4. אצבן; Sam. Pesh. אצבעון. The original is doubtless צבעון, *i.e.* ישמעאל (see above, Gad, 1). Num. xxvi. 16 gives אזני, another corruption

of ישמ' (see on Josh. xix. 34).—5. ערי. Cp. on xxxviii. 3.—6. ארודי; Num. xxvi. 17 ארוד. Cp. אֹרֵד, *v.* 21; ארדון, a Calebite name, 1 Chr. ii. 18; and see on אדר, Judahite place-name, Josh. xv. 3.—7. אראלי. Connected with אראל, אריאל, ירואל, ערל (cp. on xxxiv. 14), all of which come from ירחמאל. See *Crit. Bib.* on 2 S. xxiii. 20 (מואב, אראל), Isa. xxix. 1 (הוי אריאל).

(*h*) Asher. 1. ימנה; 𝔊[BAFL] *ιαμειν* (cp. on xxxv. 18). See on תמנע, xxxvi. 12; תמנת, xxxviii. 12.—2. ישוה, and 3. ישוי. Probably the same clan-name. Cp. on ישוי, 1. S. xiv. 49.—3. בריעה. Also an Ephraimite clan, 1 Chr. vii. 23; a Benjamite, 1 Chr. viii. 13, 16; a Levite, 1 Chr. xxiii. 10 *f.* Comparing ברשע (for other parallels see on xiv. 2), *i.e.* עֶרֶב אַשֶּׁר, we may explain בריעה as = ערב ירחע (ירחע, 1 Chr. ii. 34, = ירחמאל). In 1 Chr. vii. 23 *f.*, Ephraim has a son בריעה and a daughter שארה.—4. שֶׁרַח, the sister of the preceding sons. Possibly = חרש (Isa. xvii. 9), חרשא (Ezra ii. 52), חרם (Judg. i. 35), and, one may add, שארה (see preceding note). All these come from אַשְׁחֹר.—5. חבר, also a Kenite name (Judg. iv. 11). To be grouped with רחב, רכב, ברק; origin, ירחם.—6. מלכיאל. מלך, as often, a form of ירחמאל, which attained an independent existence, and received the formative ending אל. Cp. Milkili in Am. Tab. In 1 Chr. vii. 31 this Malkiel has a son called ברזות, *i.e.* not בְּאֵר זַיִת (Siegfr.-Stade), but עֶרֶב אַשְׁתֶּר (cp. מעלה הזיתים from מ' האשתרים, 2 S. xv. 30).

(*i*) Joseph. 1 and 2. Ephraim and Manasseh. See on xli. 51 *f.*

(*k*) Benjamin. 1. בלע. See on xxxvi. 32, xiv. 2.—2. בכר, like רכב and מכיר, may ultimately come from רקם = ירחם. Cp. on רבקה, xxiv. 15; ברק, Judg. iv. 6.—3. אשבל, like אשבעל (1 Chr. viii. 33) and שובל (xxxvi. 20), from ישמעאל.—4. גרא. Also a Benjamite clan (Judg. iii. 15, etc., probably a N. Arabian story; see *Crit. Bib.*).—5. נעמן. See on chap. xxxvii. (Adonis-myth).[1]—6. אחי. In Num. xxvi. 38, אחירם, which may be the true reading; *i.e.* אַשְׁחוּר אֶרֶם (cp. on אברם, xvii. 5). 1 Chr. viii. 1, אחרח, an expansion of אחר, *i.e.* אשחר.—7. ראש מפים. See Gray, *HPN*, p. 35. The

[1] Cp. the name of the Canaanite city Yenu'amu = Yinuamma (Am. Tab. 142, 8).

evidence points to 'Ahiram, Shephupham,' instead of 'Eḥi, and Rosh, Muppim.' Another form of the second name is 'Shuphamite,' Num. xxvi. 39; cp. 'Shepham,' Num. xxxiv. 10; 'Shiphmite,' 1 Chr. xxvii. 27; 'Shuppim,' 1 Chr. vii. 12; 'Siphmoth,' 1 S. xxx. 28. All these names, in their contexts, seem to point to N. Arabia. See *E. Bib.*, 'Shepham.'—8. חֻפִּים. Num. xxvi. 39, חוּפָם; 1 Chr. viii. 5, חורם.—9. אֹרֵד. See on 'Arodi,' Gad 6.

(*l*) Dan. חשים. In 1 Chr. vii. 12 חֻשִׁם *appears* to be a son of אחר. But the text is in disorder. Originally חשם was a son of Dan. In Num. xxvi. 42 'Ḥushim' becomes 'Shuḥam.' The original of these may be אַשְׁחֹר (cp. on שׁוּחַ, xxv. 2). Note that in 1 Chr. vii. 12, after חשם, comes בני אחר, where בני should probably be בְּנוֹ (Klost.) and אחר comes from אשחר.

(*m*) Naphtali. 1. יחצאל. Perhaps from יצחקאל; יצחק (see on xvii. 19) probably comes from ישחק, and this from אשחר.—2. גוני occurs as a gentilic in Num. xxvi. 48, and should be read, for גזוני, in 1 Chr. xi. 34. See *E. Bib.*, 'Guni,' 'Jashen,' and *Crit. Bib.* p. 362, where a southern 'En-gannim' is assumed, and this name connected with 'Guni.'—3. יצר. Cp. יצרי, a Levite name, 1 Chr. xxv. 11. Perhaps from יצהר, a Levite name, Ex. vi. 18, etc., probably from אשחר.—4. שלם. Sam. שלום. A member of the narrower Ishmael-group. See on 2 K. xv. 10, and *E. Bib.*, 'Shallum.'

ISRAEL'S MEETING WITH JOSEPH
(GEN. XLVI. 28-34)

THE climax is at hand. The narrative, which is J's, connects with *v.* 5 *b.* P's account of Jacob's arrival is in *vv.* 6, 7. We learn from *v.* 28 that Israel (so J) sends Judah (who has well proved his fidelity both to Jacob and to Joseph) before him with this object—להורת לפניו גשנה, *i.e.* literally, 'to give a direction before him towards Goshen.' The subject to להו' is omitted; most presume that Joseph is intended. Sam. and Pesh., however, read להראות, where the subject will still be Joseph. But לפניו is not natural; we should expect אליו, as in וַיֵּרָא אליו, *v.* 29. 𝔊 gives *συναντῆσαι αὐτῷ καθ' Ἡρώων πόλιν εἰς γῆν Ραμεσση.*[1] This has been learnedly and acutely explained by Lagarde,[2] but not correctly. Nor can I venture to retain my own former reading ארצה ירמות (cp. p. 479), which is too conjectural.[3] And yet some place-name positively must underlie להורת. Can we not recover it? Surely there are cases enough in which אשחור and אשחורת are deprived of the initial syllable. If, then, a place-name is wanted, and if מצרים is the N. Arabian Muṣri, it is difficult to suggest any other name but אשחורת. That the city of Joseph and of the king is without a name, has already been noted. Now, however, we see what the name of the city really was—Ashḥoreth; which accords well with the theory that 'Goshen' comes ultimately from Ashḥuran. The second לפניו is a dittograph; גשנה may perhaps be a gloss.

On receiving Judah's tidings, Joseph makes ready his

[1] 𝔊 omits *εἰς γῆν* Ραμ. both in xlvi. 28 and in xlvii. 11.
[2] *Gött. gel. Anzeigen*, 1890, p. 119 (justifying 𝔊's Heroopolis).
[3] *E. Bib.*, col. 2587, note 4.

chariot (cp. on xli. 43), and 'goes up' to the higher ground of Goshen to meet his father. A pathetic word of Israel to Joseph is followed by a clever speech of Joseph to his brethren. He will request from the king that they may be allowed to dwell in Goshen (for parallels from the Egyptian monuments see Driver, p. 372), and mentions the ground on which he will base his petition. 'The men are shepherds,' and in Goshen the cattle of the king are fed (cp. xlvii. 6 *b*). The brethren themselves are to support this statement when presented to the king. All this seems to us rather overdone, but the narrator had an object—to account for the residence of the Hebrews in the frontier province. The two clauses כי אנשי מקנה היו (*v.* 32) and כי־תועבת מצרים וגו׳ (*v.* 34) seem to be later insertions, possibly due to a redactor, who understood מצרים to mean 'Egyptians' (*v.* 34) and thought that the Egyptians really had a religious abhorrence for shepherds; the statement in xliii. 32 is quite different.

LEAVE TO DWELL IN GOSHEN
(Gen. xlvii. 1-4, 6 *b*)

Joseph reports the arrival of his father and his brothers in Goshen, and 'from the whole number of his brothers takes five men' (to present them to the king)—can this be right? Following the precedent of xix. 4, we may probably hold קצה to be a corruption of some form of אשחור (cp. on יצחק). אַשְׁחוּר would be a gloss on [מ]ארן כנען. We may then venture to read ומאחיו לקח, 'and from his brothers he took,' etc., which is quite natural. The section belongs to JE.

SETTLEMENT OF ISRAEL
(GEN. XLVII. 5, 6 *a*, 7-11, 27 *b*, 28)

P'S account of the presentation of Jacob to the king, of the settlement of Israel, of the duration of Jacob's time in Miṣrim, and of his age at his death. It is noteworthy that the land assigned to the immigrants is described as 'the best part of the land,' and designated not Goshen, but 'the land of רעמסס' (cp. 𝔊 in xlvi. 28; see above). What, then, is רעמסס?—In Ex. i. 11, xii. 37, Num. xxxiii. 3, 5, no doubt it is the name of a Miṣrite city, built by the forced labour of the Israelites. And so too it is here; the 'land of Raamses,' means the district which had Raamses for its capital. According to Professor Petrie,[1] the mound of ruins known as Tel er Retabeh, eight miles distant from Naville's Pithom, is a thoroughly suitable site for the 'store-city' of Raamses. It is true the place was not actually built by Rameses II.; indeed, there are twelve to fifteen feet of ruins beneath the buildings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties. But Rameses II. was a great builder here; the temple erected by him still exists in part. If Rameses II. was the 'Pharaoh of the oppression,' why should not the Israelites have been made to build magazines or store-houses for him? And why should not the place have been then called Raamses? But this is all conjectural, and it is very strange that the name of the oppressive king, as well as that of the city where the Israelites laboured, should not have been recorded as Raamses. 'Raamses,' be it observed, is a name which admits of more than one interpretation. Moreover, if the 'land of Raamses' means what Petrie and his predecessors

[1] *Hyksos and Israelite Cities* (1906), p. 28.

think, there is an anachronism. Joseph, as we are assured, lived long before Rameses II. I venture, therefore, to offer another explanation of the name Raamses,[1] which I take to be a compound name of a place and region near the frontier of the kingdom of Miṣrim or Muṣri. What suggested the idea was the closing syllable (as one may most naturally hold it to be) סס,[2] which, like סוס, שש, and שמש, is a very possible representative of ישמעאל (see on xvi. 15). Accepting this, we now understand רעמ, which is a popular form of אֲרָם (the southern Aram). Thus Raʿam-sus, as we may perhaps vocalise, will mean 'Aram-Ishmael,' a name equally possible for a district and for a city. Cp. רעמה, x. 7 (son of Kush, the brother of Miṣrim), and רעמיה (= אֲרַם ירחו), Neh. viii. 7. That 'Raamses' is equivalent to 'Ramessu' is neither proved, nor, in my opinion, probable.

PROGRESS OF THE FAMINE
(GEN. XLVII. 13-26)

THIS section was perhaps originally the continuation of chap. xli. (Dillm.). Its present position is due to chronological considerations. In *v.* 18 the narrator speaks of the second year, while chap. xlii. relates to the first year of the famine. The references in *vv.* 13, 14, 15 to 'the land of Canaan' are of course insertions, rendered

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Rameses' (appended remark).

[2] Cp. on Isa. lxvi. 20, Zech. xiv. 15, Ezra ii. 66 (סוס); [ו]שש, 1 Chr. ii. 34, etc.; סמי, 1 Chr. ii. 40; and for שמש, cp. בית־ש׳, and Samsi, queen of Aribu (*KAT*[2], p. 256). סמי has been rightly connected with the Phœnician סמס (Cooke, pp. 62, 81), but when Ed. Meyer suggests (*E. Bib.*, col. 3747) 'perhaps sūsīm, horses,' and Cooke (p. 62) that סמס was 'a foreign deity, introduced, like Osiris and Horus, from Egypt,' one must beg for a reconsideration of these scarcely tenable views.

necessary by the new context of the section. The object of the story is usually supposed to account for the fact that the soil of Egypt was almost entirely in the hands of the king, the land of the priests alone being exempt from taxation.[1] The statements have some affinity to those of Herodotus (ii. 109) and Diodorus (i. 73), which may have had a similar origin. At the same time it must be noticed that the details here given by the narrator are not confirmed by the Egyptian inscriptions. That by the time of the New Empire the landed property had 'passed out of the hands of the old families into the possession of the Crown and the great temples'[2] is certain, but the details of the process by which this state of things arose have not come down to us.

The question, however, must be faced. Is the text of xlvii. 13-26 altogether in its original state? That the style is awkward and marred by repetitions, is evident; Holzinger plausibly infers that more than one hand has been concerned in the composition. But no scholar has yet inquired whether the original passage may not have referred to the N. Arabian Muṣri rather than to Miṣraim. The words which specially suggest such a view are in *v.* 26, לפרעה לְחֹמֶשׁ. Our English lexicon (*BDB*) finds nothing better to do than to follow Dillmann. 'Read perhaps הַחֹמֶשׁ (Pesh.), or לְחַמֵּשׁ (𝔊).' But is there any good in tinkering such an expression? Surely not. If we read לְחַמֵּשׁ we must change its position; it has no business to stand after לפַרעה. Add to this that in xli. 34 וְחִמֵּשׁ את־ארץ מ׳ is equally suspicious. If the general view of the passage is right, why is it not וִיחַמְּשׁוּ? In connexion with this let it be noticed that חֹמֶשׁ and חִמֵּשׁ (verb. denom.) occur nowhere else, and that חמשים in Ex. xiii. 18, Josh. i. 14, iv. 12, Judg. vii. 11, and also חמשים in 1 K. xviii. 13, 2 K. i. 9-14, and Isa. iii. 3,[3] is most probably a contraction of השמנים or רַמְחַשִּׁים,[4] the fighting men of Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el (or Aram-Ashḥur) being

[1] Erman, *Life in Ancient Egypt*, p. 103. [2] *Ibid.* p. 102.

[3] Stade (*TLZ*, 1894, p. 68) would read here שר המשים, and so Winckler in 2 K. i. 9, etc. (*Krit. Schriften*, ii. 22).

[4] מ may be a fragment of רם, just as ב often is of עֶבֶר (see on 'Beṣaleel,' Ex. xxxi. 2).

specially famed for their warlike energy and discipline (cp. Isa. xiv. 31, Joel ii. 7). It is true רמחשים does not figure in the lexicons; neither does רמשק (= Aram-Ashḥur) or רמשך (see on xv. 2), whence comes the familar משך (see on x. 2). It should also be noticed that in Num. xxxii. 7 we meet with חשים, a still shorter form of רמחשים. The alternative is to read, for חמשים, חשמנים, comparing Ps. lxviii. 32, where חשמנים and מצרים are brought into close connexion; חשמן, like אחימן in Num. xiii. 22, is a distorted, worn-down form of אשחר ירחמ׳. It is therefore probable that whatever is said in xli. 33-36 and xlvii. 13-26 respecting a yearly tax of one-fifth on the produce of the land is due to a misunderstanding of חמש on the part of the editor. In xlvii. 26, for לפ׳ לח׳ we should read לְעֶרֶב לְרמשח, 'with reference to Arabia, with reference to Aram-Ashḥur,' two explanatory glosses on the preceding word מצרים. And in xli. 34, וחמש has come from הוא רמשח, 'that is, Ramshaḥ (Aram-Ashḥur).' The following words את־ארץ מ׳ are redactional.

JOSEPH'S OATH TO ISRAEL
(GEN. XLVII. 29-31, J)

ISRAEL desires to be buried in Canaan, not in Miṣrim. The Hebrew phrase, however, is not without difficulty. 'Carry me out of Miṣrim, and bury me in their burying-place' (*v.* 30). This is supposed to contrast with l. 5, 'in my grave which I have digged for myself (אשר כריתי לי) in the land of Canaan, there bury me.' Hence Wellhausen (*CH*[2], p. 62) holds that the text of xlvii. 30 (J) was altered by R out of regard to the cave of Makpelah in P (xlix. 29-32). The problem admits, however, of

a more adequate solution. The key lies in the observation that כרית in 1 K. xvii. 3 and קרית in xxiii. 2 both represent the same place-name, most probably אשחורת, and that in the latter passage the reference is to the spot where Abraham purchased land for a burying-place. It is now easy to see what must underlie כריתי לי in l. 5. That this reading is wrong, ought to be plain. There is no record elsewhere of Jacob's having digged for himself a grave in the land of Canaan; the grave referred to must be that which receives such elaborate mention in chap. xxiii. In short, אשר כריתי לי must come from אשר [ב]אשחורת ילי, and ילי must be a miswritten form of יאל, *i.e.* ירחמאל (לי and לו often represent אל). There is therefore no real discrepancy between xlvii. 30 and l. 5. 'In their burying-place' = 'in my grave which is in Ashḥoreth-Yeraḥme'el.'

After Joseph had solemnly sworn to carry out this command, Jacob, we are told, 'prostrated himself עַל־רֹאשׁ הַמִּטָּה.' In the ||, 1 K. i. 47, we have simply על־המשכב. Why, in our passage, is רֹאשׁ הַמִּטָּה given instead of הַמִּטָּה? Holzinger suggests that a teraphim may have been placed at the head of the bed, so that Jacob bowed himself (as far as was possible) towards (עַל) the teraphim. A simpler solution is preferable. Plainly we should read עַל־עֶרֶשׂ המ', 'on the couch of the bed'; cp. Ps. cxxxii. 3, ערש יצועי. The reading הַמַּטֶּה (𝔊, Pesh.) is wrong, in spite of the Egyptological illustration offered by Chabas, on which see *E. Bib.*, col. 4779, with note 1.

BLESSINGS OF JACOB (GEN. XLVIII. 13-22)

FIRST, Jacob, contrary to Joseph's intention, lays his right hand on the younger brother's head. On סִכֵּל את־ידיו in *v.* 14 Driver remarks, 'The rendering of the text (lit. *prudentes fecit manus suas*: so Ges.) is best; that of the margin [crossing his hands] is adopted by most moderns,[1] but the philological justification from the Arabic is questionable.' This means going back to Onkelos. But, as Dillmann remarks, סִכֵּל = השכיל is unknown, and after this we should expect בִּידיו. Remembering that the place-name אשכל is a compound of shorter forms of אַשֻּׁר and ירחמאל (see on xiv. 13), we must admit the probability that סכל (like לקש in Am. vii. 1) has the same origin. Glosses often intrude into the text at a good distance from the word or words to which they refer. Probably אשכל was given in the margin as a gloss on the district-name in *v.* 22 (see below). את־ידיו will then represent another gloss, viz. 'את־ירח.

Vv. 15 *f.* Next, Jacob blesses Joseph; three times he names his divine Benefactor. The third time he calls him המלאך; before, he had said האלהים. המלאך, then, should mark the climax. But how can this be? Sam. reads הַמֶּלֶך, which Geiger adopts[2] (altered to avoid resemblance to an idol-god). Much more probably, following precedents (see on xvi. 7, xxxii. 23 *ff.*), we should restore, for המלאך, ירחמאל. The N. Arabian god Yerahme'el has become the second person in a divine duad or triad, and the representative of Yahweh in affairs requiring a direct divine manifestation to men. To Jacob in his present mood the recollection of the interpositions of this gracious

[1] 𝔊 ἐναλλὰξ τὰς χεῖρας; so Pesh. Probably a guess.
[2] *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel* (1857), p. 308.

Redeemer gave an exquisite pleasure. That the Arabian Yerahme'el corresponds to the Babylonian Marduk, we have seen already. Cp. Winckler, *AOF* xxi. 464, 'The "delivering angel" is the conqueror of the monster, *i.e.* the morning star, Nebo-Marduk.'

Vv. 21 *f.* A further blessing addressed to Joseph. Not only will God bring back Jacob's descendants to the land of their fathers, but Jacob himself already solemnly assigns a special region to Joseph. In the description of this allotment there are three serious difficulties:—(1) שְׁכֶם אֶחָד. Some ancient authorities (Pesh., Onk., Saad.) explain שכם 'portion.' So, too, virtually Tuch, who thinks that the double tribe of Joseph is to have a double share of territory, שכם (like כתף) meaning, first, 'shoulder,' and then 'tract of country.' Most moderns, however, insist that שכם, if interpreted on the analogy of כתף (Isa. xi. 14,[1] Josh. xv. 8), must mean 'ridge,' 'mountain-tract,' and find in it an allusion to the northern Shechem, which is on the lower slopes of Mt. Gerizim. But is any one of these views acceptable? Prejudice apart, who would dream of translating שכם אחד either 'one portion,' or 'one tract of country,' or 'one ridge'? (2) על-אחיך. According to König (*Synt.* § 308 *d*), על seldom means 'more than.'[2] (3) לקחתי. Is this the historic or the prophetic perfect? Dillmann, Holz., Driver, etc., are for the former, Del. and Strack for the latter. To both views there are objections. If לקחתי is the prophetic perfect, we must suppose that Jacob identifies himself with his descendants in the future conquest of Shechem. It is difficult, however, to imagine Jacob doing this, nor is it easy to reconcile the implied assumption with the historical tradition. For most scholars will accept Robertson Smith's inference from the narrative in Judg. ix. that 'Shechem remained Canaanite till its destruction by Abimelech; then it became Hebrew, but not by any Israelite victory, for Abimelech and his mercenaries were not a Hebrew party.'[3]

[1] Here, however, כתף should be כפתר (Kaphtor). See on x. 14.

[2] One of the passages quoted (xlix. 26 *a*) cannot be pressed, the text being on other grounds corrupt.

[3] *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1886, p. 198.

But, on the other hand, there are great difficulties in following the favourite opinion, represented by Dillmann. If there really were an early tradition that Jacob conquered Shechem, it is not likely that a narrative so flattering to Israelitish pride would have wholly disappeared. The statements of the Jewish Haggada (see Jubilees xxxiv. 1-9 in Charles's edition) cannot be taken in lieu of this. Kuenen, therefore, has some excuse for inserting לא before לקחתי.[1] But, as Robertson Smith remarks, the expression thus produced is 'not very elegant';[2] in fact, no unprejudiced judge could for a moment accept it.

Let us now seek to adopt a fresh point of view. Here are two combinations of letters, שכם אחד and על־אחיך. Having failed to explain them on the assumption that the letters are perfectly right and that nothing has been dropped, let us study them in the light of the theory of 'recurrent types of textual corruption.' Now four points among others have emerged from the new study of the text to which this theory has given rise. (1) שכם belongs to the same group of names—for שכם, 'shoulder,' no longer comes into consideration—as משך and דמשק (see on 'Meshek,' x. 2); it is, in fact, a modification of שכרם, which comes from רמשך, *i.e.* ארם־אשחר. (2) אחד, like אחר, may represent a district-name, viz. אשחר. (3) על or אל, like יעל and יואל, may represent either ירחמאל or ישמעאל. (4) A final ך (see on אביך, xlix. 4, 25) may have come from ר, so that אחיך may represent אשחור. Let us attempt the application of these results to the present passage. The sense produced is as follows: 'And I give unto thee Shakram [Ashḥur, Yeraḥme'el-Ashḥur].' The words in square brackets are glosses, and quite correct ones. Jacob regards Joseph as the πρόμαχος of the Israelites (cp. on xlix. 24), and assigns the land of the patriarchs, *i.e.* Ashḥur-Aram or Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el, to Joseph in the first instance.

But this is only the first part of the verse. There follows 'which I took out of the hand of the Amorite with my sword and with my bow.' How improbable this reading is, we have already seen. Two questions then arise—(*a*) as to בחרבי ובקשתי, and (*b*) as to לקחתי. (*a*) Experience shows

[1] *Op. cit.*, 1880, p. 271. [2] *Op. cit.*, 1886, p. 197.

that apparently superfluous or unsuitable words, such as these, often arise out of corruptly written place- or district-names, and that an initial ב is often a relic of ערב (see on 'Beṣaleel,' Ex. xxxi. 2). We can now see into בחרבי and ובקשתי. The former word most probably comes from ערב ירחם, 'Yarḥamite Arabia,' and the latter (through רבשק, cp. רב־שקה, 2 K. xviii. 17) from ערב אשחֶר, 'Ashḥurite Arabia.' These two phrases are meant as glosses on שכרם. (*b*) As to לקחתי, it has already been remarked that it must have been Joseph, not Jacob, who was to be the conqueror of Shakram. Read therefore לקחתִּ, and (probably) אֲרַמִּי, 'Arammite' (cp. on xiv. 13).

THE FORTUNES OF THE TRIBES (GEN. XLIX.)

A SERIES of poetic descriptions of the characteristics and fortunes of the tribes of Israel in the form of blessings and curses uttered by the aged patriarch; a parallel to it is the 'Blessing of Moses' in Dt. xxxiii. Unfortunately, the text as it stands is often corrupt, and the methods used by most critics are unequal to the strain put upon them. I have myself endeavoured to supplement the old and inadequate methods by more or less new ones. The text has thus become much simpler and smoother, and that mysteriousness which Gunkel notes as a characteristic of the sayings has largely passed away. We now know, or at least seem to know, who were the actors in the supposed future events. The non-mention of the ethnic names of those actors was not due to the attempt at an obscure, oracular style, but was the natural consequence of

the corruption or perhaps deliberate alteration of the original text, as when 'Ishmael' becomes *shemen*, 'oil'; 'Yavan,' *yayin*, 'wine'; 'Ashkar,' *śerēkah*, 'a choice vine.' The ethnic names *are* mentioned, and only too frequently for our taste. We must remember, however, that our task is not necessarily in harmony with that of the original Hebrew poet, and that the ethnics assume various forms, so that there was not so much real monotony or irksome repetition as, for the sake of intelligibility, I have been obliged to use in my translation. And what, briefly expressed, is the result here arrived at? It is that the period to which the sayings in Gen. xlix. refer is that of the conquest of the N. Arabian border-land, and of the original settlement of the tribes there.

It is, for us, a fortunate circumstance that a later hand has inserted a number of glosses which illustrate the ethnic names in the text, and, generally speaking, confirm the view here taken of the songs. It is only of late years that critics have become fully alive to the intrusion of glosses into the text. I do not think that the amount of gloss-matter in Gen. xlix. has been realised by my predecessors, and still less do I think that they have made the glosses out correctly.

I am quite prepared to be told that I am blind to the evidences of the high antiquity of the sayings, chief among which is precisely the frequent hardness and obscurity of the text. It may further be said that the hardness and obscurity is not greater than that of many parts of the N. Semitic inscriptions. To this I would reply that, as it seems to me, the epigraphic readings referred to have often not been treated with sound critical judgment. I even suspect that when we have learned to apply a keener criticism to the old Hebrew texts we shall find ourselves somewhat better qualified to deal with the difficulties of the inscriptions. Professor Giesebrecht may perhaps call this *Jugendlichkeit*. If it is, so much the better. I trust that many youthful workers may follow where I have led, and succeed wherever I have failed.

Zimmern (*ZA* vii. 161-172), who has so often thrown fresh light on the Biblical writings, has attempted to show

that the sayings on the twelve tribes originally corresponded to the twelve signs of the zodiac, and that for some of them this can be fully made out. It is certainly probable that the theory that there were twelve tribes is connected with the zodiac, but it does not follow from this that the series of sayings on the tribes must contain intentional references to the twelve signs. And, as it seems to me, both Zimmern and his able followers Stucken[1] and Winckler[2] have been too venturesome in constructing a theory before the Hebrew text had been at all adequately criticised. That Zimmern's textual criticism is satisfactory will hardly be asserted after C. J. Ball's examination,[3] nor can A. Jeremias[4] hope to win much praise except for ingenuity.

Those who reject the N. Arabian clue may perhaps be referred to my article on the Blessings of Asher, Naphtali, and Joseph, in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, June 1899, which, at any rate, seems to represent, however imperfectly, a necessary stage of progress towards truth. In the following new restoration inserted words (glosses) are given at the foot of the page.

ראובן בכרי אתה	(3) Reuben! thou art my first-born,
כחי וראשית אוני[5]	My might, the first-fruits of my vigour;
פרצת כמים על־אשתר	(4) Thou didst break forth as water upon Ashtar,
בלעת משכנות עֶרֶב[6]	Didst swallow up the dwellings of Arabia.
שמעון ולוי אחים	(5) Simeon and Levi are brothers,
אכלו חמסך אסכרתים	They have torn in pieces Ḥamsak of the Askartites.
בסדם אל־תבא נפשי	(6) Into their council let not my soul come,
בקהלם אל־תחד כְּבֻדִי	To their assembly let not my mind be united.
כי באפם הרגו אשור[7]	For in their anger they have slain Asshur,

1 'Ruben im Jakobssegen,' *MVAG*, 1902, pp. 166 *ff.*
2 *AOF* xxi. 465 *ff.*
3 *Genesis* (in *SBOT*), pp. 114-116.
4 *ATAO*, pp. 248 *f.*
5 אשחר ישמעאל
6 חללת יריעות ידחמאל
7 אשחור

וערב־ישמעאל [בעברתם]	[In their fury] Arabia of Ishmael.
ארור אפם כי עז	(7) Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce,
ועברתם כי קשתה	And their fury, for it was cruel:
אחלק [שמעון] ביעקב	I will divide [Simeon] in Jacob,
ואפיץ [לוי] בישראל	I will scatter [Levi] in Israel.
יהודה יודוך אחיך	(8) Judah! thy brethren praise thee;
ידך על־ערף איביך [1]	Thy hand is on the neck of thine enemies.
גור אריה יהודה	(9) Judah is a lion's whelp;
מטרף בני עלית	From the prey, my son, thou hast gone up.
כרע רבץ כאריה	He bowed down, he couched as a lion,
וכלביא מי יקימנו	As a fierce lion, who will rouse him?
לא־יסור שֹׁפֵט מיהודה	(10) The champion shall not remove from Judah,
ומחקק מבין גֻדדיו	Nor the marshal from amidst his bands,
עד כי יבֻס שילה	Until he treadeth down Shiloh,
ולו ישתחוו עמים [2]	And to him the peoples pay homage.
יכבש בני ישמעאל [3]	(11b) He shall subdue the sons of Ishmael,
ורקם צבענים [4] ישחית	Reḳem of the Ṣibeʿonites he shall destroy.
זבלן רחוב [6] [5] יכבש	(13) Zebulun shall subdue Reḥob,
ירחמאל צידן יכרית	Yeraḥme'el of Ṣidon he shall cut off.
ישׂכר [שׂכרו] ירחמאל	(14) Iskar— [his hire is] Yeraḥme'el,
יבצֹר בין צפתים	He shall gather grapes amidst the Ṣephathites:
וירא מְנֻחֹה כי טוב	(15) He saw that his resting-place was good,
ואת־הארץ כי נעמה	And that the land was pleasant,
וַיִּתַּשׁ משכנת ישמעאל	So he overthrew the dwellings of Ishmael,

[1] ישתחוו לך בני עֲרָב [2] אשׁור לנֶגֶב יעיר ולאשכר [3] בני אתמן
[4] (v. 13) כסלחים ימענים ימנים לבני ישמן ירחמאלים [5] ימנים [6] הוא רחוב אתמן

וידי ישמעאל עֹבֵד	And Ishmael came into vassalage.
דן ידין עמו	(16) Dan shall bring redress to his people,
מֵאַשְׁחֵר ישפֹּט ישראל	Against Ashḥur he shall right Israel.
יהי־דן נחש עלי־דרך	(17) Let Dan be a serpent on the way,
שפיפן עלי ארח	A viper on the path,
הנשך עקבי סוס	Which biteth the horse's hoofs,
ויפל רכבו אחור [1]	So that its rider falleth backward.
גד גדוד יגודנו	(19) Gad—a troop shall troop upon him,
והוא יָגֻד עקבם	But he shall troop upon their heel.
אשר שנמה חלקו	(20) Asher—Shunemah is his portion,
יאחז ארמנות ירחמאל	He shall seize the castles of Yeraḥme'el.
נפתלי אריה שֹׁכוֹל	(21) Naphtali is a lion robbed of his whelps,
ארמנֹת ירחמאל יְשַׁבֵּר	He shall break to pieces the castles of Yeraḥme'el.
בנה אפרת יוסף	(22) Joseph hath built up Ephrath,
בנה אפרת עלי־עינן [2]	Built up Ephrath by Enan.
ומרֻרֹהו ערבים	(23) The Arabians sorely vexed him,
ויסֹתֻהו בעלי חצים	The archers gave him provocation.
וישבת ארמנֹת אשחרת	(24) But he destroyed the castles of Ashḥart,
וישרף מבצרי ירחם	And burned the strongholds of Yarḥam.
אביר ירחמאל [3] [4] [5] יעזרך	(25) May the Steer of Yeraḥme'el help thee,
ואל אשור יברכך	May the God of Asshur bless thee—
ברכת שמים מעל	With blessings of the heaven above,
[6] תהום רבצת תחת [7] [8]	Of the ocean which coucheth beneath,
ברכת הררי עֶרֶב	(26) With blessings of the mountains of Arabia,

1 ליש מעכת אשחורת ירח
2 בנות צֹעֶר עלי אשור
3 אבירי יעקב
4 ישמעאל־ערב
5 אביר ישראל
6 ברכת
7 בר' אַשּׁוּר וירחם
8 בר' אביר ירחמאל

תְּבוּאֹת גִּבְעוֹת יִרְחֲמֵאל	Products of the hills of Yeraḥme'el!
תִּהְיֶין לְרֹאשׁ יוֹסֵף	Let it be on the head of Joseph,
וּלְקָדְקֹד נְזִיר אֶחָיו	On the crown of the head of the prince among his brethren.
בִּנְיָמִין זְאֵב יִטְרָף	(27) Benjamin is a wolf that teareth,
בַּבֹּקֶר יֹאכַל עַד	In the morning he eateth the prey,
וְלָעֶרֶב יְחַלֵּק שָׁלָל	At even he divideth the spoil.

V. 3. A singular fate befell the blessing of Reuben. The later view was no doubt that expressed in 1 Chr. v. 1, 'for he (Reuben) was the firstborn; but, forasmuch as he had defiled his father's couch, his birthright was given to the sons of Joseph, the son of Israel.' This view of Reuben's forfeiture of his privilege in consequence of a moral offence, is based on the MT. of xxxv. 21 *f.* (J), and is also presupposed in the MT. of xlix. 4. We have already, however, found reason to criticise and correct the text of xxxv. 22, and the same course must be pursued both here and in Dt. xxxiii. 6.[1] In neither of the two latter passages (when duly criticised) is there any sign of a curse, just as little as, in the true text of Gen. xxxv. 22, there is any event recorded which is otherwise than creditable to Reuben.—Observe that *v.* 3 is not really a trimeter. Nor may we, with W. R. Smith (*Kinship*, p. 272), and Gunkel (*Schöpf.* p. 33), take יתר as parallel to פחז. The difficulties of the current explanations of *v.* 3 *b* are, in fact, insuperable. Experience justifies us in saying at once that יתר (like יתרו, see p. 40, note 3) comes from ישתר = אשתר, and that א׳ also underlies the untranslatable שאת, while עז, like בעז in 1 K. vii. 21, Ruth ii. 1, זאב in Judg. vii. 25, and זבל, Judg. ix. 28, represents ישמעאל. יתר is dittographed.

V. 4. פחז cannot be right. It ought to mean 'wanton-

[1] In Dt. *l.c.* read יהי ראובן בישמעאל; *v.* 6 *b* contains an useful gloss, הוא ישם׳ צרפתים, 'that is, Ishmael of the Ṣarephathites.' For אל־יסת compare אתמול, 1 S. x. 11, etc., for ישמעאל; similarly יתמול = מתיו = ישמ׳. מספר = ספרם; cp. ספרת and קרית־ספר, where צפר = ספר. For the difficulties of interpreters of MT. see Dillmann and Driver, and on the supposed reference of *v.* 6 *b* to Simeon (𝔊^{AL}) see Hogg, *E. Bib.*, 'Simeon,' § 3.

ness' (so *BDB*; cp. Aram.); the sense of 'bubbling over' is not sufficiently proved. But 'wantonness' does not suit, and the verses favour the second person. Having in mind 2 S. v. 20, one is led to expect פרצתָ.—אל־תותר ('cause not to remain') is easily corrected. We naturally expect the name of the people which felt the violence of Reuben's attack. Read על־אשתר (see on xxxv. 22).—כי עלית should be parallel to חללת; read בלעת, which involves reading משכנות for משכבי, and יריעות for יצועי (cp. רוחתי, Lam. iii. 56, for צוחתי). אביך must, of course, be corrected as elsewhere (see on xxviii. 13), and אז as in iv. 26. Judg. v. 19; read עֶרֶב (dittographed). עלה, too, is plainly wrong (see Ball); Lagarde proposes בלהה, Reuben כלה. From our point of view, however, 'didst swallow up the dwellings of Arabia' must be parallel to 'didst profane the tent-curtains of Yeraḥme'el,' *i.e.* for עלה read some form of ירחמאל. One or the other of these lines is a gloss.

In *v.* 5 *a* it is needless to point אחים (Ball and Marquart), a doubtful word in Isa. xiii. 21. Simeon and Levi form one of those pairs of friendly brothers which are familiar to us in legend (originally the Gemini).[1] In *b* the text is corrupt; for the contending explanations see Dillmann. Plainly the line ought to close with some ethnic; מכרתהים therefore must be wrong. כרתים, 'Kerethites,' would suit (cp. 1 S. xxx. 14), were it not for the initial מ. So at least one may be tempted to say. But the initial מ has probably come from ס; read אסכרתים, *i.e.* אשחר', 'the Ashḥartites.' Cp. on xxiii. 2. חמס (as Am. vi. 3 and in the Pss.) has probably come from חמסך[2] (or רמשח), *i.e.* ירחם אשחֶר, and כלי or כלו (see 𝔊) from עכלו. Cp. Ass. *akâlu*, 'to tear in pieces' (hence *âkilu*, of the wolf).

V. 6. Point כבֶדי, as in the Pss., for כבדי; so Dillm., Ball, Buhl, Gunkel. ברצנם from ערב־שנם, שנם being one of the corruptions of ישמ'. Cp. on ברשע (xiv. 2). איש, as often, comes from אשור, עקרו (like [עקר[ון]) most probably from אשחור; cp. on Josh. xi. 6 *b*; שור (cp. on xvi. 7) is

[1] Cp. Stucken, *Astralmythen*, i. 76; Zimmern, *ZA* vii. 162.

[2] Cp. on xii. 6. Of course, the origin of Ḥamsak (if this was the form) was not present to the mind of the poet. It was to him merely the name of a district.

from אשור—an alternative reading. Both words are corrections of איש. *V.* 6 *b* must therefore have lost a word, viz. בעברתם (see *v.* 7). In *v.* 7 metre requires the insertion of the brothers' names.

Vv. 8-11. To avoid repetition, I refer to the discussion of the blessing of Judah in *E. Bib.*, 'Shiloh.' Some (Wellhausen, Stade, Dillmann, and Holzinger) would excise *v.* 10 as a later insertion. In truth, this verse, as traditionally read, breaks the connexion in a striking manner. It must, however, be granted that the solemn dignity of the style of *v.* 10 favours its originality, and that the connexion between *v.* 9 and *v.* 11, as usually read, is by no means good. We are indeed relieved by Wellhausen's theory from the abrupt transition from the period of the conquest to that of the Messianic kingdom. But we still have the hardly less striking change from fierce warfare to idyllic peace. As to שילה, Wellhausen (like some other critics) has changed his mind. But not much is gained thereby, and in both his views he disregards the claims of metre. Gunkel seems to me right in denying that *v.* 10 is an interpolation. Turning to the text, I am on the side of Sievers in questioning אתה (*v.* 8), which is probably an early scribe's error. In *v.* 8 *b* (as in *v.* 4) אביך should be עֵרֶב; *b* seems to be a gloss (see on Dt. xxxiii. 11 *b*). In *v.* 10 Driver (with most) renders מחקק 'the commander's staff.' I doubt whether this is right. Elsewhere (see on Num. xxi. 18, Dt. xxxiii. 21, Ps. lx. 9) מ׳ is either liable to the suspicion of corruptness or has the sense of 'marshal.' Why should it not mean this here? It is true the parallel word is שֵׁבֶט. But we have instances enough of the confusion of ב and פ (see on *v.* 11, and Wellh. *TBS*, pp. 15, 170); indeed, שבט itself has been miswritten for שֹׁפֵט in 2 S. vii. 7 (cp. 1 Chr. xvii. 6), and 𝔊 here has ἄρχων (par. ἡγούμενος, cp. Tg.). See also on *v.* 16. The mistake naturally arose from the misreading רגליו (Sam. דגליו) for גִּדְדִיו; cp. on Num. i. 52. Render 'champion' ('Vorkämpfer') and 'marshal.'—The goal of Judah's ambition is the 'treading down' (read יִבֹּס for יבא, as Isa. xli. 25) of Shiloh, *i.e.* the Shiloh where was the chief sanctuary of the divine duad (see pp. 16, 33), and which in 1 S. i. 9 is (probably) said in

a gloss to have been in Ashḥur.[1] The war referred to was for the possession of the N. Arabian border-land, whose 'peoples' are to become Judah's vassals. For יקהת read, certainly, ישתחוו. In Prov. xxx. 17 יקהת occurs again; here some other correction must be sought.

In *v.* 11 we expect a suitable continuation. But how *un*suitable an one do we get! 'Very strong hyperboles,' says Gunkel. But this is the refuge of despair. Our clue suggests something better. Which are the subject 'peoples'? A gloss tells us. They are 'Asshur, with reference to the Negeb of Ya'ir, or with reference to Ashkar.' אסרי; cp. אסיר for אשור (Ex. vi. 24, Isa. x. 4), אסר (1 Chr. iii. 17). גפן for נגב, through נגף; cp. שבט for שפט, *v.* 10. עירה = יער; cp. קרית יערים = Ashḥoreth of Yeraḥme'el. לאשכר = לשרקה. Ashkar = Asshur-Reḳem (cp. *v.* 11 *b β*).—In *v.* 11 *b* we shall hardly regret the phrases, more absurd even than those in *v.* 11 *a*, about Judah's washing his garment in wine, etc. The right track will be plain from בני אתנו at the end of *a*. אתנו is, of course, אתמון = אשמעל = ישמעאל. A similar phrase is לבן־שנים, in *v.* 12, from ובני ישמן. It is therefore a description of Judah's conquest that we have. כבס is naturally a corruption of יכבש, ביין of בני, and לבושו of שובל = ישמעאל (cp. on Ezek. xxiii. 6). In the next line ובדם is not quite plain. Possibly, however, ב is a corruption of ק, and we should read ורקם צבעים ישחית; the place-name ענב (Josh. xi. 21) may well come from צבען = ישמ'. As for סותה, the word סות, 'garment,' is unknown in Hebrew. Sam. reads כסותה. The true reading is probably ישחית.

V. 12. Gunkel renders the text, 'his eyes sparkle with wine.' But this convenient rendering is unjustified. *BDB* and Ges.-Buhl give √חכל the sense of 'darkness'; the former derives the place-name חכילה from the same root. Now, 'dark in the eyes with wine' is no eulogy at all (cp. Toy on Prov. xxiii. 29). Gunkel continues, 'his teeth are white with milk.' The only objection to this is that it does not suit the context, unless we abstain from criticising that

[1] The words ואחרי שתה (1 S. i. 9) which supply an occasion for Wellhausen's lambent wit, have come from אשחור אשחר (cp. on Gen. xxv. 34). 'Ashḥur' and 'Ashtar' are alternative readings.

context. שנים, like שנם and שמן = ישמן, probably comes from ישמעאל, and if so לבן must be an imperfectly written לבני, and לב׳ יש׳ must be a gloss, or a part of a gloss, like a portion of the gloss-material in *v.* 11. This revives hope for the other words. יין, of course, may have come from יון = ימן, and חלב from חלם = ירחמאל ; עינים, as in xx. 16, xxxviii. 14, 21, from ימען (= ישמ׳) or ימענים. חכלילי remains. It is plausible to read חסלחים = the כסלחים of x. 14 (see note). Thus we get as gloss, 'Kasluḥim, Yim'anim, Yemanim (a variant), with reference to the sons of Ishmael, Yeraḥme'elites' (a variant). The whole string of names (see p. 498, n. 4) is probably a gloss on ענבים (עבנים?).

V. 13. 'For Zebulun, which was never prominent, but took a noble share in the national struggles of the Judges, the writer has nothing to eulogise but the favourable situation of its land.' So Dillmann. 'והוא, "he himself." What this antithesis of Zebulun himself and his hinder side can mean is not clear.' So Holzinger. Ball, too, sees the extreme improbability of the present text, but does not touch the roots of the evil. It is certain that both here and in Dt. xxxiii. 18 *f.* Zebulun ought to be eulogised as a warlike tribe (cp. Judg. v. 18). ישכן must surely (in spite of *v.* 11 *b*, where the same word underlies כבס) come from יכבש, and ירכתו must represent יכרית. But since *v.* 13 *b* can hardly be made into a trimeter, a word ending in (אל) על must have fallen out, probably ירחמאל. צידון is the southern Ṣidon (see on x. 15). Then, as to והוא לחוף אניות ; הוא = *id est*, and ח׳ אנ׳ is a gloss on לחוף ימים. ימים comes from ימנים (as xxxi. 23), אניות from אתמן[1] (cp. on אתנו, *v.* 11, and note that איתן, Ethan, probably has the same origin), and לחוף from רחוב (see on Judg. v. 17, 1 K. ix. 26 *f.*).

Vv. 14 *f.* Issachar, or more strictly Ishkar (see on xxx. 18), is also rather badly treated by the final redactor. Dt. xxxiii. 18 creates a presumption that Ishkar and Zebulun once had similar blessings. Let us, then, look closely into the text. 'Ishkar is a bony ass,' or (Ginsburg,

[1] Cp. Dt. xxviii. 68, where the very strange באניות (Driver, 'in slave-galleys') has certainly come from ערב־אתמן (= 'Arabia of Ishmael'); cp. ברשע, xiv. 2, from ערב־אשר. Also Judg. v. 17, where באניות has come from באיתן or from באתמן (see *Crit. Bib. ad loc.*).

Introd. p. 253, after Sam.) 'the ass of strangers'! Not so. חמר (cp. on xxxiii. 19) and גרם (cp. on 'Gomer,' x. 2) are two of the current corruptions of ירחם; they are variants put side by side. This assumes that a word has fallen out, *i.e.* probably שְׂכָרוֹ—a play upon the name of the tribe. רבץ should probably be יִבְצֹר; the vintage may be either literal or metaphorical.—המשפתים covers over an ethnic, viz. צפתים (see on Judg. v. 16).—For מְנֻחָה read, with Ball and Holz., מִנְחֹה. Seeing that his desired territory was so fair—what did this warlike tribe do? Surely he conquered the Ishmaelites, and reduced them to vassalage. סבל and סמל are attested corruptions of ישמ' (see on Ps. lxxxi. 6, Dt. iv. 16). For Issachar as a warrior, see Judg. v. 15. Prof. Hogg's suggestion (*E. Bib.*, col. 5387), to attach the last couplet of *v.* 15 (Issachar) to *v.* 13 (Zebulun), now loses its object.

Vv. 16-18. It is Dan's turn. 'He shall judge his people as (successfully as any) one of the (other) tribes of Israel' (Driver). How poor! And what does 'his people' mean? The members of the tribe of Dan (Wellh., Stade, Holz., Gunkel)? or Israel (Ewald, Del., Dillm.; cp. Dt. xxxiii. 7)? The principle of parallelism should be our guide. We require a parallel to ידין, and there the parallel is. שבטי should, of course, be ישפט; see on *v.* 10. We now see that אחד, as often, has come from אַשְׁחֹר; the prefixed כְּ should be מִ. The ejaculation in *v.* 18, according to Ball, is a later insertion. But why should a pious scribe put it in just here? Probably it is a corruption of a string of place-names (cp. on *v.* 11 *a*)—an early gloss, defining the position of Dan. The names seem to be, Laish, Maakath, Ashḥoreth, Yeraḥ. קויתי has surely come from קרית (cp. on xxiii. 2). יהוה for ירח (as elsewhere).

V. 19. Cp. Erbt, *Die Hebräer*, p. 41. Read with all moderns, עקבם, and in *v.* 20, אָשֵׁר.—'Asher, his bread is fat.' A very meagre blessing, even if לחם could be feminine. In Dt. xxxiii. 24 *f.* a keen criticism shows that the victories of Asher are referred to. Must it not also be so here? Superficial corrections are useless. Onk. and Pesh. suggest ארצו or אדמתו. But שמנה is not less suspicious than לחמו. We expect the name of a district. Now שנם (doubtless from שמן = ישמ') is a well-known place-name in Issachar.

There may well have been a Shunem or Shunemah (= an Ishmaelite settlement) in Asher. For לחמו read perhaps חלקו; Ball, too, suggests either ח׳ or נחלתו.—והוא יתן וגו׳. 'Dainties of a king' is as improbable as 'fat bread.' Probably מלך, as often, represents ירחמאל, while מעדני is an easy corruption of ארמנות (a word frequently corrupted). יתן probably comes from נות, a fragment of the same word. והוא may have come by metathesis from יאחז.

V. 21. And what of Naphtali? 'A greatly corrupted distich' (Ball); 'not to be explained with certainty' (Gunkel). Surely the critics are too languid. Ball's elaborate theory is ingenious, but it interferes with the Blessing of Joseph, nor is it safe to refer to 1 K. iv. 7-19 as proving that Naphtali helped to supply Solomon's table. Remembering the praise of warlike Naphtali in Judg. v. 18, let us read (for the obscure and improbable אילה שלחה) אַרְיֵה שָׁכוּל (cp. Hos. xiii. 8). For the figure as applied to a conqueror, Jer. iv. 7, v. 6, and Isa. xv. 9 (?) supply sufficient parallels. In *b*, אמרי, like אמר, ארם, [אמר]יה, represents ירחמאל. A verb is wanting; we can find it, however, underneath שפר. Just as שבטי (*v.* 16 *b*) has come from ישפט, so may שפר have come from יְשַׁבֵּר. הנתן (which gives no clear sense) must represent some noun in construction with ירח׳, most probably ארמנות; the intermediate form may be הרנת.

Vv. 22-26 contain the Praise of Joseph, out of which B. Luther separates *vv.* 24-26 as originally referring to Jacob (Meyer, *Isr.* p. 110). The text, as all admit, is very corrupt; nor can I think that the corrections as yet offered are very fortunate; so few critics as yet seem to have taken notice of recurrent types of corruption. Now as to *v.* 22. The text used by 𝔊 must have been nearly the same as the traditional Hebrew text (see Ball). Certainly neither 𝔊 nor the Massorites have made much of the text; *υἱὸς ηὐξημένος* and *bēn pōrāth* are both absurd. Wellh. (*CH*, p. 322) deserves credit for suggesting that פרת = אֶפְרָת.[1] He further suspects an allusion to the old

[1] On the ground of Dt. xxxiii. 17, Zimmern thinks that Joseph must have been compared to an ox; but שורו in that passage is a corruption of אשור (Asshur). See further, on *v.* 25.

name of the fruitful highlands in which Benjamin and Joseph dwelt, and from which 'Ephraim' derived its name. It is true that פרת, like Balaam's פתור, may also have arisen out of פתרס (see on 'Pathrusim,' x. 14). But אפרת is certainly the more probable origin (cp. on ii. 14, xv. 18). But what as to בן? 'Son of Ephrath' is not a natural description of Joseph; it would answer better for Benjamin (Gen. xxxv. 18 *f.*). And unless, with Sievers, we read יוסף בן פ׳ עלי־עין (omitting the initial בן פרת), we shall fail to make up the first trimeter in the distich, if we adhere to the reading בן. The easiest supposition is that בן covers over some verb. The best sense would be produced by קנה. Ephrath, consecrated by the legend of the tribal mother Rachel, had to be redeemed, and Joseph redeemed it. But בנה lies nearer at hand, and may be similarly interpreted. Ephrath, which had been overthrown, was 'built up' by Joseph. The position of Ephrath is mentioned to distinguish it from other Ephraths; it was עלי־עין, or rather perhaps עלי־עינן. A place Haṣar-ʿênân is mentioned in Ezek. xlviii. 1 (xlvii. 17); possibly *ʿênân* comes from *yimʿean* = Yishma"el. It was near the border of Dammesek (if 𝔊 and MT. are correct), or perhaps, originally, Ramshak (see on xv. 2). It was in a region which for centuries was a debatable land (see 2 S. viii. 6, 1 K. xx. 34, Am. iii. 12, vi. 3).[1] This may not impossibly be the Enan referred to (as I conjecture) in the Praise of Joseph.—We next come to בנות צעדה עלי־שור (on versions, see Ball). The commentators say that בנות means 'branches' and צעדה 'mounted'; Gunkel rightly questions this. בנות both in poetry and in legendary prose means, 'dependent towns'; may not this be the meaning here? If so, render 'the subject towns of Zoar (read צֹעַר) by Shur (*i.e.* Asshur in N. Arabia).'

In *v.* 23 וְרָבוּ is 'clearly ungrammatical' (Ball); and there is no √רבב, 'to shoot,' hence Ball prefers the וירִיבֻהו of Sam. (= 𝔊 ἐλοιδόρουν). Hitherto, however, we have

[1] The handbooks do not give much light on these passages. The recorded wars of David, of Ahab, and of the king or kings contemporary with Amos were probably in the south, not in the north. Cp. *Hibbert Journal*, July 1905, p. 831.

found that historical colouring is by no means wanting in these sayings. Comparing the ירב of Hos. v. 13 (‖ אשור), let us restore ערבים. The reference is to the N. Arabian archers (cp. on Hos. ii. 20, Ps. lxxvi. 4).[1] That the Arammites of N. Arabia were archers is shown independently by 1 K. xxii. 34. In the next line parallelism suggests ויסתהו.—*V.* 24 is still stranger in MT. Following 𝔊, Ball reads קשתם for קשתו, but is not quite clear about באיתן; *BDB* render 'as a firm one' (*Beth essentiæ*). 𝔊 begins with *καὶ συνετρίβη*, *i.e.* תשבר, which Ball adopts; but will this reading do? Surely we must try to go behind 𝔊's text. The ר in תשבר may belong to the following group of letters, and underneath רבאיתן it is not difficult to discern ארמנות, a word which we need not be surprised to find so often, because tradition must certainly have preserved a recollection of the castles and fortresses of the foes of Israel.[2] ותשב probably comes from וישבת. קשתו remains. The word may look innocent enough; but remembering how often in compound names קש or חש represents אשחר, we are led to examine a selection of passages containing קשת, and find strong reason to believe that it may be a corruption of some form of אשחור, most probably אשחרת (cp. חרשת, Judg. iv. 2).—We may now hope to restore the text of the next line, ויפזו זרעי ידיו. This is, of course, impossible, especially if we connect it with the following words, 'and the arms of his hands became active through the hands of the Steer of Jacob.' 𝔊's *καὶ ἐξελύθη* suggests, for ויפזו, וירפו, which, in fact, I myself formerly adopted, reading וירפו אצילי ידיהם. But we must again look behind 𝔊. וירפו (no less than ויפזו) may have come from וישרף, and זרעי from מבצרי. ידיו is obviously a mutilated form of some word corresponding to אשחרת, and since by no ingenuity can מידי, which follows, be made tolerable, we may venture to hold that מידי and ידיו both represent the same word (dittographed), viz. ירחם.

But have we not thus made it doubly difficult to explain the rest of this verse? Certainly, if we have had

[1] I am afraid Dr. Briggs does not even see the problem of this passage (see 'Internat. Comm.' *Psalms*).

[2] Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Fortress.'

no experience in spying out glosses. *V.* 24 *b β*, according to Dillmann, means 'from there, where is the shepherd of the stone of Israel'; the accents, however, make 'the shepherd' and 'the stone of Israel' two divine titles in apposition. Both views are evidently most improbable. Nor is any fresh light thrown upon the passage by Ed. Meyer and his helper B. Luther. This is what the former says:[1] 'That all four names—the Steer of Jacob, the Shepherd of the Stone of Israel, the God of thy father, and El Shaddai—designate Yahweh, and the three first as the God of Jacob, is clear, so that the "Stone of Israel" can hardly help being the holy stone of Bethel.' The latter, however, according to Meyer, now prefers to identify the stone with that set up, as we are told (Josh. xxiv. 26 *f.*) at Shechem by Joshua. Now, I fully agree that in far-distant times the ancestors of the Israelites may have called their supernatural friend and helper their rock (צוּר, סֶלַע) or their stone[2] (אבן), as well as their steer (אביר), and that these titles (which originally presupposed stone-worship and animal-worship, as a part of primitive animism) may have descended to later times as poetical images. But I deny that 'the shepherd of the stone of Israel' and 'the stone of Israel' can be treated as synonyms, *i.e.* that רעה can be practically ignored. Textual criticism must be applied. It is not enough to say, with Meyer, that this or that passage as it stands is 'quite impossible' or 'entirely corrupt.' The honour of our craft requires that we should rectify the impossible and heal the corrupt. How, then, shall we heal the undoubtedly corrupt line 'משם רעה אבן ישר'? Several previous attempts are mentioned by Dillmann, to which my own may be added (*PSBA*, 1899, p. 3). So much is clear, that the line is superfluous. All that we require is a couplet, and this can be obtained from the opening of *v.* 25. This opening runs in MT.—

מאל אביך ויעזרך
ואת שדי ויברכך ;

[1] *Die Israeliten*, p. 283.

[2] Though, as a matter of fact, we never (even in Ps. xviii.) find Yahweh called אבן.

but we shall see presently that the true reading most probably is,

אביר ירחמאל יעזרך
ואל אשור יברכך.

Consequently all in MT. that precedes, viz. [1] אביר יעקב and the highly corrupt line quoted above, must be an accumulation of glosses or variants. אבן ישר׳ is, of course, for אביר ישר׳, which, not less than יעקב, is a correction of אביר ירחמאל. משם (𝔊 variously read מִשָּׁם and מִשֵּׁם), like שם (see on 'Shem,' v. 32), represents ישמעאל (so too משם in the highly corrupt passage Isa. lxv. 20); [2] רעה probably represents עֵרָב (cp. הרעים from הערבים, Am. i. 2). Thus we get 'Ishmael-Arâb,' a gloss on 'Yerahme'el.' I may note in passing (against Ball, Holz.) that *ὁ κατισχύσας* Ισρ. in 𝔊 is simply a paraphrase of אביר ישר׳. The variation from *δυνάστου*, just before, may suggest that *ἐκεῖθεν κ.τ.λ.* is a later insertion.

I now pass on to מאל אביך יעז׳. מֵאֵל אָבִיךָ can hardly be right. If Abraham is referred to, why is not אברהם put? If Jacob, why not simply אֵלִי? Again and again both אבי and אביך have come from עֵרָב (see on *v.* 4). The objection to following this precedent here is that the text gives us, not אֵל, but מֵאֵל. Is there no other correction of מֵאֵל אָבִיךָ possible than מֵאֵל עֵרָב? There is; אביך may have come from אַבִּיר. This view harmonises with the most obvious correction of מאל, viz. ירחמאל or ישמעאל (see on xxi. 33). Let us, then, omitting the ו prefixed in MT. to the two verbs as redactional, read אַבִּיר ירחמ׳ יעז׳, and continue ואל אשור יב׳; אֵל for את (following 𝔊, Sam. Pesh.), and אשור for שדי (see on xvii. 1). If any one hesitates, let him turn to Dillmann, Driver (pp. 392, xvii.), and Gunkel, and ask himself if the critical methods and conclusions of these scholars and of those to whom they refer in passing, commend themselves as adequate and probable. Cp. Dt. xxxiii. 16, where, instead of 'him that dwelleth in the thorn-bush,' we should read 'him that dwelleth in Sinai.'

[1] That יעקב comes from ירחמאל, has been pointed out (on xxxii. 29).

[2] The prophecy appears to be, that in the ideal future no Arabian who adhered to his heathenish rites should any longer defile the Holy City by his presence.

The passage is in another Blessing of Joseph, and here too Joseph's God is referred to as an Arabian deity.

It is in accordance with this that the blessings showered upon Joseph are not only those of the heaven above (rain, night-mist, sunshine) and of the subterranean flood[1] (fountains and streams), but of the 'mountains of Arabia' and the 'hills of Yeraḥme'el.' Let us now turn to textual details, having also before us the not less corrupt parallel passage, Dt. xxxiii. 13-16. In *v.* 25 Gunkel, on metrical grounds, omits the picturesque רבצת, which indicates the continued dangerousness of *tĕhōm* (cp. Tiāmat). I would rather omit ברכת, reading ותהום (Deut. ומתהום).—We next hear of 'blessings of the breasts and of the womb' (בר׳ שדים ורחם). The phrase is quite possible, though Deut. xxxiii. 13-17 has nothing parallel. But what is there for a parallel line? Gunkel sees that if there is one, it must underlie ברכת אביך גברו על, and proposes to read בר׳ אָב אַף גֶּבֶר וָעוֹל, 'blessings of a father, yea, of a man and a child.' Similarly, in *PSBA* (1899) I suggested ברכת חסדו ורחמיו, 'with blessings of his lovingkindness and compassion,' following this up with בר׳ אביך יעקב, 'with blessings of thy father Jacob,' and putting the couplet thus produced after that referring to the mountains and hills. If, however, we apply our key consistently, we must regard *v.* 25 *b* and the opening of *v.* 26 as a combination of glosses, viz., 'with blessings of Asshur and Yarḥam,' and 'with blessings of the Steer of Yeraḥme'el.' Here אשור takes the place of שדים, or rather שדי (see on xvii. 1), and וירחם of ורחם, and further אביר ירחמאל of אביך גברו על. On אביך see above, and for ירחמ׳ = גברו על cp. גבריאל (Dan. viii. 16), the name of the archangel who is the double of מיכאל.[2] Both these names are independent corruptions of ירחמאל. May I add that Wellhausen (*TBS*, p. 25) is unwisely satirical on the אִמְּךָ which he supposes to underlie 𝔊's *καὶ μητρός σου*, which is merely an expansion of a corruptly written dittograph of *καὶ μήτρας* (ורחם)? So Ball.

In *v.* 26 we may fairly ask whether such rhetorical

[1] Cp. vii. 11, Ex. xx. 4, Am. vii. 4, Ps. xxiv. 2.

[2] Cp. also the Assyrian names Gabri, Gabri-ilu (Johns, *Ass. Deeds*, iii. 471).

phrases as 'the eternal mountains' and 'the everlasting hills' are probable. In Dt. xxxiii. 15 the corresponding word to עד is קדם, which cannot mean 'eternal,' and is probably (see on xxix. 1) a corruption of רקם (= ירחם). I am aware that הררי עד, for הורי עד, is often quoted as a typical emendation (𝔊 *ὀρέων μονίμων*). But it needs itself to be corrected, as also probably does הררי עד in Hab. iii. 6. The original texts probably had הררי עֲרַ׳, 'mountains of Arabia,' to which the parallel phrase is גבעת ירחמאל (cp. on xxi. 33).—תאות, 'desire' (for 'desirable things'), is clearly wrong. Read תְּבוּאֹת (Olsh.; Cheyne, *PSBA*; Gunkel). Cp. Dt. xxxiii. 14.

FUNERAL OF JACOB (GEN. L. 1-11).

JOSEPH commands 'his servants the physicians' to embalm the body of his father (*v.* 2, J). This statement may have been right for Miṣrim, but not for Miṣraim, embalming being the business of a special guild in Egypt. After the forty days required for the embalming, we learn that there was a public mourning of the Miṣrites in honour of Jacob, which lasted seventy days (*v.* 3 *b*, perhaps E). But we have been already told (xlvii. 30) that Jacob had given directions that his remains should be carried out of מצרים. Joseph therefore has to be represented as obtaining leave from the king to 'go up' to Canaan to bury his father. In this way, not only xlvii. 30, but also the tradition respecting Jacob's burying-place, receives full justice. The high officials of מצרים accompany the grand vizier and his family—a high honour for the Hebrews! The goal of the mourning company is said to have been the 'buckthorn threshing-

floor' (גֹּרֶן הָאָטָד); the spot is described as situated בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן (*v.* 10). There the great ceremony took place.

The definition of the site has caused the critics much perplexity, for it seems to imply that the funeral procession made the circuit of the north end of the Dead Sea, instead of taking the direct route from Egypt (Miṣraim) to Ḥebron by Beer-sheba. To meet the difficulty it has been supposed that the place called גרן האטד was not really identical with אבל מצרים, though in *v.* 11 the names are certainly represented (by the redactor, who perhaps inserted בגרן הא'?) as belonging to the same place. We may admit (so some critics think) that there was a place called Abel-miṣraim ('Egyptians' meadow') which was beyond the Jordan, but it is probable that originally this place-name had no place in the story.

A different view has been proposed by Winckler,[1] who is followed in the *Enc. Biblica* ('Abel-mizraim'). He holds it to be clear that a place called 'Abel of Miṣrim' on the south border of Palestine is intended, and thinks that הירדן has been miswritten for הנהר, *i.e.* the נחל מצרים (see on xv. 18). Ed. Meyer is sarcastic about this,[2] but unwisely. Miṣrim is *a priori* much more likely to occur in a name than Miṣraim, because in the Israelitish period, so far as known to us, the N. Arabian people had much more to do with the Israelites than the Egyptians, and a close examination of place-names is quite consistent with this (cp. Judg. ix 37, where interpret, 'tree of the Ishmaelites'). Winckler's theory marks a step forward. But there is something to be added for, as we have seen already (on xiii. 10), הירדן has, in many passages, most probably arisen out of הַיַּרְחֹן. The spot intended was in the Ashḥurite region. This is at any rate the most obvious inference from the name miswritten גרן האטד, for אטד, like (*a*) ארט in viii. 4, 2 K. xix. 37, Jer. li. 27, (*b*) אטר in Ezra ii. 16, 42, Neh. vii. 21, 45, עטרה in 1 Chr. ii. 26, עטרות in Num. xxxii. 3, Josh. xvi. 2, 5, 7, etc., is as closely connected with אשתר as אחר again and again is with אשחר (Ashḥur[3] = Ashtar).

As for the other name, אבל מצרים, the only uncertainty

[1] *GI* i. 174, note 2. [2] *Die Israeliten*, p. 280, note 2.
[3] On 'Ashḥur' see p. 177, note 2.

is about אבל. It seems to me probable that אבל in a place-name is to be explained like בעל, *i.e.* as a shortened form of ירחמאל.[1] It indicates either that the god Yeraḥme'el was worshipped in the place, or simply that the place was anciently a Yeraḥme'elite settlement. מצרים may indicate that the Miṣrites had either conquered or been conquered on the spot referred to. A strikingly parallel name is Abel-meḥolah (cp. Māhōl = Yeraḥme'el, 1 K. v. 11).

On the strange phrase in *v.* 5—אשר נריתי לי—see above, on xlvii. 29-31.

l. 23. מכיר. The name מכירו is attested (see Cook, *Gloss.* p. 72) as N. Aramæan. But originally it indicated a southern population. Makîr and Menasseh are virtually identical; indeed, the whole of Menasseh was one great *gens* of Makîr.[2] In 1 Chr. vii. 15 (𝔊) Makîr's mother is said to have been an Arammite concubine; by 'Arammite' the original writer must have meant 'Yeraḥme'elite.' But מנשה, as we have seen (on xli. 51), is an Ishmaelite or Yeraḥme'elite name. מכיר therefore is a name naturally borne by the son of Menasseh and an Arammite woman. Obviously it comes from ירכם, *i.e.* ירחם; cp. the Benjamite name מכרי (1 Chr. ix. 8), which stands among distinctly N. Arabian names, and must come from כרמי or רכמי, also רקם (see on xxix. 1), a name which occurs later on in the genealogy of Menasseh (1 Chr. vii. 16, grouped with אולם, another undeniable derivative of ירחמאל). This accords well with the position of Makîr in the same group with Shobi (cp. Shobal = Ishmael) and Barzillai (= Arab-Ishmael) in 2 S. xvii. 27.

But I must not omit to criticise Ed. Meyer's very different view (p. 516). Makîr, according to him, means 'the purchased one, the possession'; he compares, from H. Ranke, the Babylonian names Makûr-Sin, Makûr-Nannar. Apparently he means that Makîr is shortened from Makîr-Yahweh, or the like, *i.e.* 'the possession of Yahweh.' The objection is that מכר does not mean 'erkaufen' but 'verkaufen.' The Assyrian dictionary-makers are careful not to derive Makûr, 'possession,' from a root *makâru*, 'to purchase.' There is also abundant

[1] See p. 24.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Machir.'

evidence to show that Semitic names often had two forms, the one (secondary) religious, the other (underlying the first) purely secular. Therefore, even if Makîr could mean 'Yahweh's purchased one,' it would be purely secondary. And last of all, if we insist on giving Makîr its most obvious (but not therefore correct) meaning, 'sold one,' it must surely belong properly to Joseph (see xxxvii. 36), not to Joseph's grandson.

THE OPPRESSION OF THE ISRAELITES (Ex. I.)

THE opening section (*vv.* 1-5), from P, need not detain us. In the following composite narrative two accounts are given of the oppression of the Israelites. According to one (J), the Israelites are both more numerous and stronger than the Miṣrites, and a fear comes to the new king of מצרים, who is ignorant of the services of Joseph, that the Israelites may some day join some other people and fight their way out of the land. According to the other (E), the Israelites are so mean-spirited that they let themselves be oppressed, and put to compulsory labour on the fortifying of the cities Pithom and Raamses (?). According to the one, the services of midwives are used to destroy the male children of the Israelites (in Goshen); according to the other, the Miṣrites (in whose midst, and not in Goshen; the Israelites dwell) are commanded to destroy the male children themselves, by casting them into the river.[1]

We have already (see on xlvii. 11) met with the 'land of Raamses (?),' and found that the name רעמסס is most probably compounded of רעם = אֲרַם (the S. Aram) and סס = ישמעאל. The city referred to in *v.* 11 and in xii. 37 bore

[1] See Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, pp. 41-44.

the same name as the district. פיתם (Pithom ?) is here mentioned for the first time. From the meritorious researches of Ed. Naville it is generally supposed to be identical with Tel-el-Mashûṭa in the east of the Wâdy Ṭumilât, which closely adjoins the place anciently called Tku, and is identified by Naville with Succoth.[1] The Egyptian name of Tel-el-Mashûṭa is given as P-atum, *i.e.* 'house (abode) of Atum'; Atum is the sun-god of Heliopolis.[2] It has been suggested that Pithom and Etham (Ex. xiii. 20) may be the same place.[3] All that I can accept of these plausible but uncertain conjectures is the connexion of the names פיתם and איתם; not that they are designations of the same place, but that they have to be similarly accounted for. In fact, פ[י]תם is best derived on the analogy of פיכל and פי בסת from אבי־תמול = עֲרַב־ישמעאל, and אתם on that of איזבל from אבי־שמל = עֲרַב־ישמ׳.[4] To these two names, commonly read Pithom and Raamses (𝔊 Πειθω and Ραμεσση), 𝔊 adds 'On (און), that is, Heliopolis.' From our point of view, 𝔊's addition of 'On' is of no great moment. Some N. Arabian place is meant.[5] Note that in Ezek. xxx. 17 און and פיבסת (= עֲרַב ישמ׳) are parallel (see also on Gen. xli. 45).

The mention of brick-making (*v.* 14; cp. v. 7, etc.) is an important feature in the narrative. It does not, of course, necessarily point to Egypt (see Isa. ix. 9), but, considering that elsewhere in the Exodus story מִצְרַיִם and מִצְרָיִם are confounded, the most natural conclusion certainly is that Egyptian, not Arabian circumstances, are here referred to. To quote from Professor W. Max Müller, 'in Egypt, not only all houses, but also all palaces, many tombs (including several of the smaller pyramids), and some temples, were constructed of Nile-mud bricks.'[6] This suggests the

[1] The identification, however, is 'not absolutely certain' (Spiegelberg, *Aufenthalt*, p. 24).

[2] See Naville, *The Store City of Pithom and the Route of the Exodus* (1885).

[3] W. M. Müller, *E. Bib.*, cols. 1411, 3783.

[4] Or perhaps Etham may be = Ethman (Ishmael).

[5] 'Beth-aven' (Josh. vii. 2) may come from 'Beth-on,' and refer to a N. Arabian place.

[6] *E. Bib.*, 'Brick,' § 1, and cp. the illustration on p. 37 of Spiegelberg's *Aufenthalt Israels* (captive Asiatic brick-makers in Egypt).

hypothesis that the original story of the Exodus which referred to Miṣrim or Muṣri was recast on the hypothesis that the land where the Israelites sojourned, and whence they came out, was Miṣraim or Egypt.

As to the name or title of the oppressing king of מצרים, no uniformity exists either in J or in E. Both documents use פרעה as a proper name, but not so as to exclude the use of 'king of מצרים'; I speak here, of course, of the whole narrative, and not specially of chap. i. But in *v.* 8 a statement is made (by J) which requires examination: 'There arose a new king over מצרים.' מלך חדש is a singular phrase. It is not enough to say[1] that the statement is vague, and does not warrant the hypothesis that the rule of the Hyksos had come to an end. We have to meet the question whether the original text has been faithfully transmitted. That the king of Miṣrim who succeeded Joseph's patron (read *v.* 6 and *v.* 8 together) should so completely reject that patron's policy towards the Hebrew immigrants needed and surely must have received some explanation. In Judg. v. 8 (see *Crit. Bib.*) חרשים has probably come from אשחרים, and in Josh. xv. 37 חדשה from אשחרה, also in Judg. iv. 2 חרשת from אשחרת. It is possible that מלך חדש has come from מלך אַשְׁחֲרִי, and that the original writer meant that a new dynasty had risen which was of Ashḥurite origin. That Ashḥurites did from time to time hold sway in Miṣrim appears from 1 K. xi. 40, if the suspicious שישק[2] or שושקים (𝔊 *σουσακειμ*) is rightly explained as אשחר or אש' ירחמ'. The Ashḥur from which the oppressing king came would presumably be the larger Ashḥur. This is why he has no religious sympathy with the Hebrews (cp. p. 458). On the other hand, the two midwives, who are Miṣrites and not (as Baentsch supposes) Israelites, are god-fearing persons (i. 17; cp. Gen. xx. 3, xli. 39) and refuse to comply with the king's cruel command. By 'Miṣrites' I mean here not 'Egyptians' but 'belonging to the land of Muṣri.' Their names are not Egyptian[3]—

[1] Holzinger, *Ex.*, *ad loc.*

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Shishak.'

[3] According to Winckler, the midwives are ultimately two forms of Ishtar, the goddess concerned with births (see Zimmern, *KAT*, p. 428) This is possible; the names may have been changed.

which is unfortunate for the Egyptological argument. שפרה has certainly to be grouped with שפר, Num. xxxiii. 23, and פרש, 1 Chr. vii. 16, and פועה with פואה, Judg. x. 1. For the former, however, 𝔊 has *σεπφωρα*, *i.e.*, צפרה (see on ii. 21). The *crux interpretum*, עַל־האבנים (*v.* 16), should perhaps be אֶל־הָאֲמָנִיֹּת (אמן from ארמן), *i.e.* 'to the Yerahme'elite women,' a gloss on למילדת, *v.* 18. Cp. 'Abanah,' 2 K. v. 12. I do not think that any of the other proposed interpretations are natural, nor has Spiegelberg hit the mark.

The story of the persecution of the male children is introduced for the sake of Moses (cp. Matt. ii. 16 *ff.*). Omit Ex. i. 15-22 and ii. 1-10, and nothing will be lost for the story of the Exodus as a whole. Evidently the oppressing king who plays a leading part in that narrative knows nothing of the cruel command to destroy the male children.

THE CHILD MOSES DELIVERED (Ex. II.)

How deliverance came to the child Moses who was placed in a box of papyrus-reeds, and hidden among the rushes of the stream, in order to comply with the letter of the royal edict (i. 22). How his sister watched him, till a great personage—the king's daughter—found the box and had compassion on the weeping child. How, through his sister's clever reply to the princess, the child enjoyed maternal nursing, but was afterwards adopted as her son by the king's daughter, who called his name Môsheh (Moses).

This charmingly told story is of mythic origin. Its central feature—that of the exposing of a divine or heroic infant on water—is also characteristic of the Babylonian, the Greek, the Roman, the German, and even the Japanese

mythologies.[1] The nearest parallel, however, is the Babylonian story of Sargina. Just as the old mythic story attached itself to the traditional personality of Moses, so, in Babylonia, it was adapted to the tradition of 'Sargina, the powerful king, the king of Agadé.' Originally the story most probably referred to a woman who conceived by divine intervention.[2] It might therefore, from a Jewish point of view, have been told even better of Isaac than of Moses, unless, indeed, we suppose that Amram, like Abram (Gen. xvii. 17), was advanced in years. There is, however, one difference between the Moses-story and that of Isaac, viz. that in Ex. ii. 1 both the father and the mother of the much-favoured child are unnamed. In this respect the Moses-story agrees with that of Sargina.[3] 'My mother was poor,' we read, 'my father I knew not. . . . My mother, who was poor, conceived me, and secretly gave birth to me.' The two stories agree further in this—that both the children are committed for safety to an ark or basket of reeds daubed with bitumen (חֵמָר). Sargina is carried safely by the stream to his destined preserver; Moses remains where he is placed, among the reeds on the edge of the river.

It is singular that there should also be an Indian parallel. The story is no doubt strongly Indian in feeling; but the motives are the same as in the Moses and the Sargon story. Surya the sun-god appeared to the maiden Kunti (Pritha), and promised her a son like himself. By his 'energy' a son was actually born to Kunti, without detriment to her virginity. At once, 'in consultation with her nurse, [Kunti] placed her child in a waterproof basket, covered all over with sheets, made of wicker-work, smooth, comfortable, and furnished with a beautiful pillow. And with tearful eyes she consigned it to the (waters of) the river Asva.' We are then told that the basket with the child, 'borne along the waves of the Ganga, arrived at the city of Chamba.' There a member of the Suta tribe and his wife, walking by the

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Moses,' § 3; and for the Japanese story see also Stucken, *Astralmythen*, pp. 231 *ff.*; *Beiträge* (1902), p. 3.

[2] Winckler, *Arabisch-orient.-semitisch*, p. 115.

[3] Winckler, *Gesch. Isr.* ii. 91; he renders *enîtu*, 'poor.' So Rogers, *Hist of Bab. and Ass.* i. 362. Others, 'a Vestal.'

river, beheld and took the basket. They were childless, and the wife 'duly adopted that boy of celestial appearance and birth.' He was, in fact, born with a golden coat of mail, and with two ear-rings which 'sprang from amrita.' How great a part is allotted to him, as Karna the great archer and rival of Arjuna, even the dilettante reader of books about Indian literature is aware.[1]

The ark (תֵּבָה) of Moses is parallel to the ark (also תֵּבָה) of 'gopher-wood' in which Noaḥ, or Ḥanôk, was borne on the mighty waters of the flood. The latter, too, was coated with bitumen (כֹּפֶר). Similarly, the water in which Moses was so nearly drowned is parallel to the ocean-flood which enveloped pre-existent and unorganised matter till the Creator-god overcame it. It may illustrate this that in Ezek. xxix. 3 (if I am not mistaken) the king of Miṣrim is identified with the great dragon (the personified ocean-flood of the cosmogonic tradition).[2] Lastly, of Ḥanôk (the true hero of the deluge-story), we are told (Gen. v. 24, P) that Elohim 'took him,' and of Moses it is stated (Dt. xxxiv. 7, P) that 'his eye was not dim, neither had his vigour fled.' His burying-place, too, 'no one knoweth unto this day' (*v.* 6), which suggests that, according to an earlier form of the story, Moses, like Ḥanôk, had ascended into heaven. Thus the beginning and the end of this hero's earthly life are full of the supernatural.[3]

It is a significant fact that there is no Egyptian parallel to the story of the child Moses' deliverance, unless indeed we are content with a late story of an incarnate Horus, son of the negress who was 'found in the reeds.'[4] That גֹּמֶא and סוּף, and even תֵּבָה (all in *v.* 3), may have an Egyptian origin, makes no difference. They are good Hebrew words, and we could not be surprised to find them anywhere in

[1] See Dutt's prose translation of the Mahabhârata (vol. iii. 1896, pp. 436 *ff.*). With this Roy's version agrees, but in the account of the wicker box (or basket) it adds the detail that 'its surface was laid over with wax, and it was encased in a rich cover.'

[2] See my *Bible Problems*, p. 249.

[3] I cannot follow Winckler (*GI* ii. 95), whom A. Jeremias (pp. 257 *f.*) repeats.

[4] Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis*; cp. J. H. Wilkinson, *Liberal Churchman*, 1905, p. 205.

the O.T. Nor does יְאֹר (*v.* 3; cp. i. 22) necessarily imply that the original narrator meant 'the Nile' (see on Gen. xli. 1). The mention of bitumen, too, rather suggests, as the place of origin of the story, either Babylonia or the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea.

Now as to the name Môsheh. It is still customary[1] to trace this name to the Egyptian *mes* or *mesu*, 'child.' Egyptologists tell us that Min-mes was the name of the chief magician under Rameses II.; was he the Hebrew sage (Acts vii. 22)? But how very improbable this theory is can easily be shown. (1) The Hebrews would surely not have accepted an Egyptian name for their great deliverer; did Ṣaphenath-pa'neaḥ (if this form may be tolerated), which critics also regard as Egyptian, supplant Joseph? To this it may be added (2) that the vowel in *mes* (*mesu*) is short, whereas *o* in Môsheh is long,[2] and (3) that the other names in the exodus-story (Pineḥas, Ḥûr), supposed to be Egyptian, have quite another origin.[3] If so, then what is the most probable origin of משה (Môsheh)? Of course, not 'one who draws forth,' a fit name for Yahweh, but not for Moses. Like מושי (vi. 19) it must be grouped with the names עמשי and מעשי, which either come from ישמעאל, or at any rate contain an element (שי) which represents that widely-spread name. It is, in fact, parallel to אהרן (Aharon, Aaron), which surely has no connexion with אָרוֹן (Redslob, Ed. Meyer), but comes naturally from אשחרן, 'Ashḥurân' (*i.e.* belonging to Ashḥur). That אחר is often = אשחר is by this time clear. Cp. also אחרון, in the phrase הים האח', from אשחרן. Note the S. Arabian personal names quoted by Hommel (in Ulmer, *Die semit. Eigennamen*, pp. 35 *f.*), viz. 'Aharân, Hûrî-'ahar, 'Ammi-'ahar, and 'Ahar-il, which, however, Hommel cannot explain. See also on iv. 14.

[1] Holzinger and Sayce are exceptions. The name 'Moses,' says the former, is 'unexplained.' It is from the Ass. *mâshu*, 'hero, leader,' says the latter (*Hibbert Lect.* p. 47; but cp. Muss-Arnolt, *Ass. Dict.*, *s.v.*). Jensen also has doubts.

[2] W. M. Müller, *E. Bib.*, 'Moses,' § 2.

[3] Ed. Meyer grants this for Ḥûr, but not for the two other names (*Die Israel.* p. 450). He infers from this admittedly singular fact that there must be 'something true' in the statement of the relations of Moses to Egypt. In none of these views can I follow Meyer.

EARLY LEGENDS OF MOŠES (Ex. II. 11-22)

MOSES, now of full age, goes out, espies a Miṣrite smiting a Hebrew, and kills the tyrant. The next day he interferes between two Hebrews striving together, but discovers that the bold action of yesterday has become known. The king, too, has heard of it, and seeks to kill Moses, who therefore flees to the land of Midian.

There is some uncertainty as to the exact position of this region. Our safest plan just now is to keep to the Hebrew texts. From Gen. xxv. 2 (cp. on *v.* 6), xxxvii. 25, 27 *f.*, Judg. viii. 22, 24, it appears that 'Midian' was a branch of the great Yeraḥme'elite or Ishmaelite race, and from Ex. iii. 1 (cp. Hab. iii. 7) that their country was near Mt. Horeb or Sinai, the true situation of which was not that which later tradition affirmed.

The name of the Midianitish place where Moses has arrived is not mentioned. Naturally he rests himself by the well. There he performs another generous act. The seven daughters of the priest (and prince) of Midian have come to draw water, and to fill the troughs for their father's flock; but 'the Arabians' (הערבים;[1] not 'the shepherds,' הרעים) come and drive them away. The object of the Arabians is probably to make a prize of the sheep and goats. But the chivalrous stranger first 'delivers them (the maidens) out of the hand of the Arabians,' and then draws enough water for them and for the flock.

The maidens return home. 'How is it that ye are so early?' asks the father. For it takes time to 'roll the stone

[1] A plausible correction. For how should the shepherds treat the daughters of their priest so badly? See on 1 S. xvii. 40, xxi. 8, Jer. vi. 3, Am. i. 2.

from the well's mouth,' and then to water the flock (Gen. xxix. 8, 10). So Moses is sent for; he has kept respectfully in the background. He dwells with 'the man'—for the name of the priest is not mentioned—and marries his host's daughter Ṣippōrah, by whom he has a son called Gershom.

May we fill up the *lacunæ* of this story? Did Moses take sanctuary with the Midianite priest? Surely the narrator was not thinking of this. His aim was to bridge over the isolated story of the danger and deliverance of the child Moses, and it was another narrative which brought Moses into close connexion with the Midianites. Very possibly, however, more was originally said of the Midianite priest than is here given. The prevalent N. Arabian form of government was probably the theocratic, in which the ruler was God's viceroy and therefore also God's priest.[1] To the narrator, however, the host of Moses is simply 'the man' (*v.* 21). J apparently did not give his name; at any rate 'Reuel' in *v.* 18 belongs to the redactor.

As to the names which do exist, it would be absurd to suppose that they are really historical. They are, indeed, such as might be borne by individuals. But there we must stop; the early story of Moses is plainly legendary. And just as משה (cp. מושי, vi. 19) is a development of עמשי, or some other popular form of ישמעאל, so רעואל (*v.* 18,[2] Num. x. 29), יתרו (iii. 1, iv. 18, xviii. 1 *ff.*), יתר (iv. 18), and חבב (Num. x. 29, Judg. iv. 11), all of which are in different places assigned to Moses' father-in-law, come respectively from ירחמאל (see on Gen. xxxvi. 4), אשתור (see on יטור, Gen. xxv. 15), and ירחו־ערב (see on יובב, Gen. x. 29). צפרה, like צפור (Num. xxii. 2), points to צרפת; cp. also צרפי (Neh. iii. 31), and see *E. Bib.*, 'Moses,' § 4. It is J who relates the marriage of Moses, but in Num. xii. 1 E mentions that Moses had married a Kushite woman (כֻּשִׁית).

[1] Cp. the Assyrian *patesi*, the Sabæan *mubarrib*, and perhaps the Minæan *kabire* (Nielsen, *Die altarab. Mondreligion*, p. 137). There were also, of course, priests confined to the cultus, called in N.-W. Arabia *lewi* (Hommel, etc.); some compare Levi.

[2] Not in 𝔊 (*v.* 18). In *v.* 16 𝔊 twice inserts Ιοθορ. In Gen. xxxvi. 10, Reuel is an Edomite.

Probably, however, כוש (as a N. Arabian regional name) is a shortened form of אכוש (אכיש, 1 S. xxi. 11, etc.), *i.e.* אשכר = אשחר. We must remember that Ṣippōrah's father is best known as יתרו, a name which (as we have just seen) means that his home was in Ashtarite (or Ashḥurite) territory.[1] Her son, too, is called גרשם (cp. Sinaitic גרשו), *i.e.* not 'expulsion,' nor 'his name is our guest,'[2] nor 'a stranger, or fugitive, is the moon,'[3] but, like גרשון (vi. 16, Gen. xlvi. 11), is formed from שחר = אשחר. See also on שגר, xiii. 12, and on גשן, Gen. xlv. 10, and note that in 1 Chr. xxiii. 16 the son of Gershom is Shebuel (= Ishmael); also that שמגר in Judg. iii. 31 (v. 6) comes from גרשם and ענת from איתן. Note that N. Arabian names mean N. Arabian legends.

One question remains. Did the earliest tradition represent Môsheh (Moses) as a Levite? No. Originally he must have been a divinely sent and semi-divine hero, the deliverer of Israel. Very soon, however, the ideal of the hero was fused with that of the priest and the legislator, and a clan traced its origin to the ideal representative of the higher priesthood. A Môsheh-clan arose, which attached itself to the tribe of Levi, the tribe which combined religious enthusiasm with warlike energy, and became the guardian of the sacred objects. The higher priesthood existed side by side with the lower. The work of the former was to report divine oracles, and give decisions in the name of God; that of the lower, to attend to the cultus, to guard the holy vessels, and, if need were, to fight. Môsheh, as has been noticed by Nielsen, represents the higher style of priest, Aharôn the lower. Both are connected by E with Levi. In ii. 1 we read respecting the father and mother of Môsheh, 'There went a man of the house of Levi, and took (to wife) the daughter of Levi.'[4] So at least the text has to be translated, and if the name of the maiden is not mentioned, we must suppose that this is due either to accident or to the redactor. In iv. 14 we are told that

[1] In Gen. xxxvi. 26 we find יתרן, *i.e.* יתר (= אשתר) with the ending ן. Ithran is a Ḥorite (Ashḥurite).

[2] So Nielsen, *op. cit.* p. 131. [3] Winckler, *AOF* xxi. 470.

[4] 𝔊, however, has ὃς ἔλαβεν τῶν θυγατέρων Λευι, מבנות לוי, which Baentsch adopts.

'the anger of Yahweh was kindled against Moses, and he said, Is there not Aaron thy brother the Levite?' But whether Moses and Aaron are rightly connected thus with Levi is a question difficult to answer (see p. 232).

THE BURNING BUSH (Ex. III. 1-6)

How Mal'ak Yahweh (or Elohim) appeared to Moses and declared his name. We have two accounts (E and J) of this great event. According to one, 'Moses kept the flock of Jethro his father-in-law, and led the flock . . ., and came to the mountain of the Godhead, to Ḥoreb. And Elohim called to him and said, Moses, Moses! and he said, Here am I. And he said, I am the God . . . And Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon Elohim.' According to the other, 'Mal'ak Yahweh appeared to him in a flame of fire out of the midst of . . . And he looked, and behold! . . . burned, and . . . was not consumed. And Moses thought, Let me now turn aside, and see this great sight, why . . . is not burnt up. And when Yahweh saw that he turned aside to see, he said out of the midst of . . .,[1] Come not nearer, draw thy shoes from thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.'

On J's account the following comment is given by Prof. Ed. Meyer:[2]—'Where this thorn-bush (סנה) is situated we

[1] Arranging the text in accordance with the documentary analysis.

[2] *Die Israeliten*, pp. 3, 4. Unfortunately Gressmann (*Eschatol.* p. 56) also supposes that סנה, 'thorn-bush,' and סיני must be connected. He admits, however, the 'singularity' of the idea that Yahweh's holy plant was the thorn-bush, and conjectures that the reason is that there was an overgrowth of this bush on Sinai (= 'the overgrown with thorn-bushes'). A poor sort of mountain! For Nielsen's view—that the Seneh was a kind of cassia used for sacrifices of incense—see his *Altarab. Mondreligion*, pp. 134 *f.*

are not told; the article (הסנה) shows that it is assumed to be universally known. In the extant literature it only occurs in the old song, Dt. xxxiii. 16, where Yahweh is called שׁכני סנה, "the inhabiter of the thorn-bush." We have therefore before us an old popular faith, which afterwards became obsolete, according to which Yahweh has his proper and permanent dwelling-place in such a bush surrounded by a flame. The name of the bush סנה—the word occurs nowhere else—clearly alludes to Sinai, which the older view placed, not on the "Sinaitic" peninsula, but in Midian.'

I am afraid that some of the weakness of our textual criticism reveals itself here. Neither Meyer nor any one else has yet proved that such a word as סנה, 'thorn-bush,' belonged to the old Hebrew *Sprachschatz*. The lexicons do indeed refer to Dt. xxxiii. 16, but this is plainly dependent on Ex. iii. 2; if the latter passage was misread, and סנה given for some other word, the final redactor of Dt. xxxiii. would take care that the same false reading should be given in the former passage. It is not probable, either that there was a sacred thorn-bush in the land of Midian so universally known to Israelites that it could be referred to by one of their narrators, or that in our narrator's time the idea that Yahweh was the *numen* of a thorn-bush was widely prevalent. Moreover, had some sacred plant been meant, some tree would surely have been chosen; one recalls the burning terebinth of Mamre,[1] and the burning walnut-tree spoken of to-day at Nebḳ.[2] We may at least be thankful that the 'fire' is not rationalised into the fire-red blossoms.[3] No one nowadays is unaware of the meaning of lambent flames. But why is there such true insight into the meaning which the flame about the bush would have if the bush were really mentioned, and such a want of criticism of the word rendered 'bush.' And yet in Dt. *l.c.* some critics have already discerned סיני underneath סנה, and it is only a step further to read הַסִּינִי (or הַר סיני) for הסנה in Exodus. To suppose with Meyer and others an *allusion* to the name סיני is very far-fetched indeed.

[1] W. R. Smith, *RS*[(2)], p. 193.
[2] Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, p. 193.
[3] Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*, ii. 13; cp. Gray, *E. Bib.*, col. 615.

It is J and P who use the name 'Sinai' for the sacred mountain; E prefers 'Horeb.' According to Winckler,[1] חרב means 'glowing heat,' *i.e.* the sun at the summer solstice, and סיני 'belonging to Sîn, the moon-god.' It is very doubtful, however, whether names such as סין (xvi. 1, xvii. 1, etc.) are really monuments of the wide-spread cultus of the Babylonian moon-god; the analogies which have been accumulating rather point to an ethnological origin. Perhaps חרב should be grouped with the clan-name חבר (see on Gen. xlvi. 17); at any rate, סין (see on xvi. 1, and on Gen. x. 17) comes from ישמן = ישמעאל, like סנה, the name of a well-known rock in 1 S. xiv. 4. Certainly the pre-Israelitish name of the sacred Arabian mountain was, not Sin's mountain, but 'Yeraḥme'el's mountain,' which the Israelites changed into 'Yahweh's mountain' (Num. x. 33) or 'the Godhead's mountain' (*v.* 1).

And where was the sacred mountain situated? We get most definite information from 1 K. xix. 3 *f.*, which has, I hope, been cleared up in *Crit. Bib.* (pp. 347 *f.*), except that it should be further noticed that אל-נפשו (EV, 'went for his life') must have come from אל-ישמ' = אל-שמון (cp. דרך י[ו]ם, *v.* 4, 'towards Yam (= Yaman or Yeraḥme'el)).' But even our Exodus-passage speaks plainly enough—'he led the flock אחר המדבר.' 'Behind the wilderness' is, of course, a wrong reading; what sort of topographical notice is this? In order to produce clearness, we have but to recollect one of the commonest textual corruptions, viz. אחר for אשחר (cp. 1 K. *l.c.*), and then transpose the two words of the phrase (omitting ה as redactional). Thus מדבר אשחר, 'to the wilderness of Ashḥur.' It was here that in its terrible grandeur the holy mountain rose.

As the narrative stands, one might suppose that the Hebrew shepherd approached the mountain quite unsuspiciously. The sequel, however, is hardly favourable to this view. Deeply had he been stirred by the fate of his people, and this inward experience must surely (if we may give the reins to our imagination) have prepared him for some change in his outer lot. So, when a divine voice is heard addressing him, he bravely listens. He has not,

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Sinai,' § 3.

however, heard of the danger of 'touching' even the border of the mountain (xix. 12 *f.*) without physical preparation; the divinity himself, therefore, must tell him what to do.

And who is the Great Being who thus communes with Moses? According to E it is Elohim, by which E means either Yahweh, or perhaps Yerahme'el (see p. 69), who was thought even by the Israelites to have a special interest in human affairs. According to J it was either Mal'ak Yahweh or Yahweh; there is, however, no difference between the names, for Mal'ak means Yerahme'el, who is, strictly speaking, the second member of the divine duad, but may be put first when it is he who specially reveals himself to human eye and ear (p. 369).

Now Mal'ak Yahweh, among his other aspects, was a fire-god (see p. 31). This was why he spoke to Moses, as afterwards to the Israelites (Dt. iv. 11, 12), out of the midst of burning Sinai. As Dr. C. T. Beke long ago maintained,[1] Sinai was most probably a volcanic mountain, and though it may not have had eruptions within the O.T. period, yet tradition may have told of its pristine activity. That the phenomenon described in iii. 2 is not altogether as terrible as that in Ex. xix. 16, 18, may be admitted. But the narrator is justified in mitigating the terrors of primitive Sinai out of condescension to Moses at the outset of his career. Still, we are told that Moses 'hid his face' (cp. 1 K. xix. 13, Isa. vi. 2). Every one knew that to see God was dangerous to life (xxxiii. 20, Gen. xxxii. 31).

The language in which this great Being makes himself known (*v.* 6) appeals to us, as it must also have appealed to all Israelites who knew and loved the stories of the patriarchs. But it does not follow that the present form of words is exactly that chosen by the original writer. Indeed, it is not certain that the words are, strictly speaking, intelligible. 'I am the God of thy father' (cp. xv. 2, xviii. 4). What, pray, does this mean? Is it the father of Moses who is referred to? But neither E nor J appears to have known who the father of Moses was; and, in any case, how could Moses' father take precedence of the three great patriarchs?

[1] See p. 563, and cp. Gunkel, *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, p. 160; Gressmann, *Eschatol.* pp. 42 *ff.*; Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, p. 69.

Now it so happens that there are parallel passages in the text of Genesis in which similar stumbling-blocks occur. Let the reader refer to the notes on these (*i.e.* on Gen. xxviii. 13, xxxi. 29, xxxii. 9, xlix. 25), and he will see the justification of reading here אלהי ערב־ירחם אלהי אשחר, where two variants are put side by side (אביך = ערב, אברהם = ערב־ירחם ; יצחק = אשחר). After the original reading had been miswritten the redactor (as also in *v.* 15) added ואל׳ יעקב. We cannot blame the redactor; the sense produced, except as regards אביך, is satisfactory. It will be noticed that in *vv.* 13, 15, 16, אל׳ אבותיכם takes the place of אל׳ אביך (*v.* 6).

THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF GOOD TIDINGS (Ex. III. 7-15)

A GLORIOUS divine promise is next given. By means of Moses the people shall be brought out of Miṣrim into 'a good land and a large.' Moses hears devoutly, but finds two difficulties, which Elohim considers and removes. The first relates to Moses' qualifications for so great a task; the second to the name of the God who sends him, for the Israelites will desire to know this name in order that they may duly invoke it in their cultus.

In *vv.* 8 and 17 (also Lev. xx. 24, Num. xiii. 27, Dt. vi. 3, xi. 9, etc., and in Jer. and Ezek.) the promised land is described as one 'flowing with milk and honey.' The phrase probably comes from old poems or legends tinged with mythology. That the original Canaan (wherever situated) was not deficient in milk and honey appears from Gen. xviii. 8, Judg. iv. 19, v. 25, etc.; Gen. xliii. 11, 1 K. xiv. 3 (honey); Judg. iv. 8 *f.*, 18, 1 S. xiv. 26 *f.* But we

shall not fully realise the charm of the expression unless we trace it to some mythic description of the Golden Age, *i.e.* of Paradise, and remember that the Paradise of the Hebrews was originally placed in the N. Arabian border-land.[1] The ethnics in *v.* 8 *b* are probably a gloss (see on Gen. x. 16 *f.*, xiii. 7 *b*).

Of the two difficulties mentioned by Moses, the second is in much need of an improved explanation. The timid man whom his God is training into a hero is at a loss to know what name to give to his Sender when he goes among his people. He is sure that they will ask to be told the name of his God, and he knows not how to answer them (*v.* 13, E). Hence a special revelation is given, but what that revelation was is still undetermined. Most critics assume that some new name of God was revealed; *i.e.* that the name 'Yahweh' was here (according to E) for the first time made known to Moses, and through him to the Israelites. אהיה אשר אהיה is therefore considered to be an explanation of the name יהוה; it is rendered either 'I am that which I am,' or 'I am because I am,' or 'I will be that which I will be,' all most unsatisfactory,[2] and, as regards the first and the third, leading up to the view of Lagarde and Ed. Meyer that the Speaker endeavours to evade answering the question (cp. Gen. xxxii. 30, Judg. xiii. 18). Difficult, too, in another way, is the second half of *v.* 14. How can אהיה be represented as the name of the God who sends Moses? Should we not expect יהוה?[3] Textual criticism, however, may suggest some other explanation. אֶשֶׁר, as we have seen already not unfrequently comes from אֹשֶׁר, which is a possible divine name, and אהיה may be a corruption of אשחור, which is

[1] See pp. 85 *ff.*, and cp. *E. Bib.*, vol. ii. (1901), 'Honey,' 'Marah,' 'Paradise,' § 9; Usener, *Rhein. Museum*, n.f., lvii. 179-192; Stade, *ZATW*, 1902, pp. 325 *ff.*; Guidi, *Bollettino*, 1877, p. 424, and *Revue biblique*, 1903, pp. 241 *ff.* (milk and honey the most exquisite drink that a pastoral people could imagine).

[2] See Baentsch or Dillm. *ad. loc.*; and cp. Driver, in *Studia Biblica*, i. 15-18 (1885); Kautzsch in *E. Bib.*, col. 3323; also *Life of Max Müller*, ii. 279 (supposed Zoroastrian influence).

[3] Holzinger and Budde (*Religion of Israel*, p. 14), also W. R. Arnold, would even read יהוה for אהיה.

another form of the same divine name. אשר and the second אהיה (*i.e.* אשחור) may therefore be, the first a gloss, the second a dittograph. *V.* 14 thus becomes, 'And Elohim said to Moses, Ashḥur; and he said, Thus shall ye say to the Israelites, Ashḥur has sent me unto you.' Out of this, 'Ashḥur' and the attendant gloss and dittograph, together with the following 'and he said,' may safely be cut out as scribal and redactional, so that all that Elohim said to Moses was, 'Tell the benê Israel, Ashḥur has sent me to you.' That a redactor has been at work is plain, not only from *v.* 14,[1] but also from *v.* 15, which is practically an extended gloss on *v.* 14, but which has probably supplanted some further statement of E, according to which Yahweh was now combined with the older name Ashḥur. That the whole story has superseded a tradition of a contest between Yahweh and Moses, in which the latter won the revelation of the name Yahweh (see on xvii. 1-16), is a needless conjecture.

A few phrases may here be commented upon. First, 'Yahweh the God of the Hebrews' (iii. 18; cp. v. 3, vii. 16, ix. 1, 13, x. 3). The phrase may well surprise us; for if the Israelites had but the other day been made acquainted with Yahweh, how could he at once be called the 'God of the Hebrews'? In Ezek. xx. 7 we find a polemic against the devotees of Miṣrite deities. There may have been a tradition in Ezekiel's time of a special Yahwist propaganda. At any rate, the worshippers of Yahweh can hardly have been more than a sect, as compared with the worshippers of El-Arâb, El-Asshur, or El-Yeraḥme'el.—In the same passage let us note the modest requirement of a 'three days' journey into the wilderness' (so v. 3, viii. 27). Prof. Petrie[2] thinks this phrase 'unmeaning to one who does not know Sinai' (*i.e.* Serbal). 'Three days,' however, is a conventional phrase (see on v. 3) for 'a short journey.' It was enough for the Israelites to remove to a short distance from Miṣrite territory.

[1] Prof. W. R. Arnold's art. on Ex. iii. 14 (*JBL* xxiv., 1905, pp. 107 *ff.*) is learned, but textually too conservative. He thinks that *v.* 14 *a* is a Midrashic gloss on *v.* 14 *b*. There is indeed an element of truth in this. But אהיה אשר אהיה is surely corrupt.

[2] *Researches in Sinai* (1906), p. 203.

—In iv. 14 occurs the phrase 'Aaron the Levite.' Aaron (Aharôn, אהרן; see on ii. 10) need not originally have been the brother of Moses; he seems to belong to a different traditional stratum, according to which he, and not Moses, was the supposed progenitor of the Levites, *i.e.* of the priests (Dt. xviii. 1 *ff.*). To make a distinction between the 'brothers,' Moses was represented as a bad speaker, and Aaron as his spokesman (iv. 16).

MOSES GOES TO MIṢRIM (Ex. IV. 18-26, JE)

MOSES now sets out on his great enterprise. Fearing lest his father-in-law should seek to detain him, he only speaks of desiring to visit his brethren, *i.e.* his relatives (Gen. xiii. 8, xxix. 12). The danger to Moses, however, is not as great as it might have been, for the Miṣrite king who had sought his life is dead (see ii. 15, 23); *v.* 19 indeed says, 'all the men.' So Moses, either alone (so E), or with wife and child[1] (so J), takes the road to Miṣrim, carrying with him his wonder-working staff.

This 'staff' (מַטֶּה) first appears in iv. 1-9 (J). It is a part of the apparatus of an enchanter (vii. 11, 12; cp. Winckler, *GI* ii. 92). E states (differently from J) that God entrusted Moses with a staff which he had not previously possessed, to perform his wonderful works (iv. 17; cp. 20 *b*), and that of the five 'plagues' four were produced by his lifting up or stretching out his staff. Cp. also the Rephidim-story (xvii. 8-12). P, however, attaches thaumaturgic importance to the staff of Aaron.[2] See further *E. Bib.*, col. 3210.

[1] Read בָּנָו. It is E who gives Moses two sons (see on xviii. 1 *ff.*).
[2] Cp. 2 K. iv. 29 (Elisha's staff, משענת).

On the way a wonderful thing happens. In his first night-quarters Yahweh falls upon Moses as if to kill him. A fatal issue is only averted by the promptness of Ṣippōrah, who takes a flint-knife and circumcises her son, so appeasing the angry deity. This is the origin of the expression 'a bridegroom of blood,' first applied by Ṣippōrah to her husband. So at least the present text appears to mean. But what a strange story it is, especially when we recall the great task so lately assigned to Moses.[1] It must be old, says Holzinger,[2] because of the 'heathenish' representation of Yahweh. 'Colouring and tone,' says the same critic, 'remind us of the story of Jacob's wrestling.' But there are differences between the narratives. In Gen. xxxii. 25 *ff.* the divine 'man' is unknown to Jacob. But taking *vv.* 24-26 as they stand, no one would say that Moses and his wife failed to recognise Yahweh in the angry assailant. Nor has Jacob's great antagonist a design upon his life, whereas the god who attacks Moses is like one of the dangerous and malicious Jinn of Arabian folklore. It is a mere guess (1) that Moses has offended Yahweh by omitting to be circumcised, (2) that Ṣippōrah supposes that the circumcision of her son will do instead of the circumcision of Moses, and (3) that the story aims at accounting for the transference of circumcision from the age of youthful maturity to that of infancy (Gen. xvii. 12). The story as it stands is unintelligible, and the explanation of חתן דמים from the Arabic *ḫatana* 'to circumcise,' *ḫatan*^{un} 'son-in-law,' which has long been prevalent,[3] is only justifiable if the context is in the main correct and rightly understood. The latest and not the least eminent of our critics [4] has already affirmed that it has not yet been understood aright. His own explanation, however, is by no means satisfactory, owing to his omission of textual criticism.

It is true previous scholars had started on a wrong track. Baentsch, for instance, thus explains ותגע לרגליו (*v.* 25),

[1] Carpenter-Harford, *Hexateuch*, ii. 85.

[2] *Exodus*, pp. 9-16; cp. *Einl. in d. Hex.* p. 133.

[3] Wellh. *Prol.*[(3)] pp. 354 *f.*; Stade, *ZATW* vi. 142 *f.*; *Enc. Brit.*[(9)] 'Circumcision.'

[4] Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, p. 59.

'berührt damit die Füsse, d. h. hier die Scham oder Genitalien ihres Mannes.' His notion is that Ṣippōrah applied circumcision in a roundabout way to her husband, and so appeased Yahweh's wrath. He compares 2 K. xviii. 27, Isa. vii. 20, xxxvi. 12, and Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 410. But the later critic goes much further. 'It is clear,' he says, 'that Ṣippōrah applies a charm which is to work on Yahweh.' And he adds, 'also wirft sie die Vorhaut am Jahwes Geschlechtsteile, so dass diese blutig werden; und jetzt ist er ihr Blutbräutigam—das kann nur heissen, dass er sie als Braut heimgeführt hat und davon blutig ist.'

Our critic further conjectures that in the original legend much more distinct expressions were used. 'It is almost a miracle that J preserved the narrative, and that later scribes did not strike it out.' The wonder, perhaps, rather is that modern critics should have been capable of accepting the story as it stands, and should have supported their interpretations by comparing passages, many of which, critically viewed, are equally liable to suspicion.[1]

The unsatisfactoriness of the current criticism naturally suggests approaching the subject from a new point of view. Prof. H. P. Smith seeks for light from the highly archaic usages of the tribes of Central Australia as expounded by Spencer and Gillen.[2] The underlying theory is that both the blood and the amputated skin of circumcision are powerful charms, and that in case the actual rite cannot be performed, blood obtained from the place of circumcision will be equally effective. Prof. Smith conjectures that Moses had delayed to sacrifice his son, and that Ṣippōrah saw that the blood of the (circumcised) boy would be accepted, though his life was spared. The editor was reluctant to preserve such a primitive notion; hence the

[1] I quite admit that בכף־ירכו in Gen. xxxii. 26 *a* is correctly read, and refers to Yahweh (see p. 399). But the context of that passage is perfectly clear, which is not the case here. As to 2 K. vi. 25, x. 27, xviii. 27, Isa. xxviii. 8, 10, see my *Critica Biblica*. It may be added that, even morally, a keener and more methodical textual criticism corrects a number of O.T. passages which have been applied to the discredit of N. Semitic manners. Our commentaries and histories seem to need much modification on such points.

[2] 'Ethnological Parallels to Ex. iv. 24-26,' *JBL* xxv. 14 *ff.* (1906).

fragmentary form of the story. But however this may be, Prof. Smith is pretty certain that when the Hebrew tradition arose, it was already the custom to 'rub the blood from a young man, or from a child just circumcised, or to rub the amputated piece of skin, on the men of the clan,' and that 'tradition supposed this to have arisen because at one time Moses was very ill, and was saved by the circumcision-blood of his firstborn son.' The original ending of the paragraph before us was probably this,—'Therefore, to the present day, when a child is circumcised, the foreskin is rubbed on the feet of each man of the family.' But Prof. Smith fully admits that 'the present ending is unintelligible.'

It seems to me that we can hardly expect that such a narrative as this acute scholar supposes would have been preserved even in a modified and fragmentary form. That being the case, we must try what textual criticism of the newer sort can do. This strange story ought, it would seem, to be grouped with the equally doubtful narratives in Josh. v. 2 *ff.* and 1 S. xviii. 25-27, and with the Dinah-story in Gen. xxxiv. In all these passages the apparent references to circumcision (מל, מול, ערלת, ארלים) are due to textual corruption. Following these and other precedents (for מלון see on Josh. iv. 3), we may read, for בדרך במלון, במדבר עלמון, while יהוה should probably be ירח' (*i.e.* ירחמאל); 'Yeraḥme'el' would here be used like עמלק in xvii. 13 ('Amalek' comes from 'Yeraḥme'el'). ערלת בנה may come from בני ערלים, 'the sons of Arel' (*i.e.* Yeraḥme'el).[1] The enigmatical ותגע לרגליו should perhaps be גבעת רגלים, 'at the hill of Rogelim.' 'Rogelim' seems to be one of the corruptions of 'Yeraḥme'el'; but its origin had, of course, been forgotten when this story took shape (for רגל, see on Gen. xxxiii. 14, Judg. v. 15). חתן דמים, too, can hardly be right. It may be a corruption of מחיתי [א]רמים (cp. xvii. 14), and אתה לי may come from ישמעאל = אתבאל, a gloss on [א]רמים. וירף ממנו may be derived from הוא ערב ירחמאלים, 'that is, Arabia of the Yeraḥme'elites' (cp. on פרא אדם, Gen. xvi. 12 *a*; ממנו occurs sometimes for מאלים). The final clause, beginning אז אמרה, is virtually a dittograph,

[1] ערל = ירחמאל has been abundantly proved. See on Gen. xxxiv. and on Ezek. xxxii. 19 *ff.*

introduced because of למולת, which is another explanation of [א]רמים, meaning 'with reference to Ethmaal (= Ishmael).' Cp. תמול and אתמול, often (*e.g.* 1 S. x. 11) for אתמעל.

The story thus understood is a glorification of Ṣippōrah, who, with nothing but a sharp stone, rudely fashioned perhaps into a knife, succeeded in wounding and dispersing a band of Arabian marauders. Both Moses (see on ii. 17 *a*) and Ṣippōrah have, therefore, proved their courage against the Arabians. It is difficult to be quite sure of the text, but one correction (viz. לאתמאל for למולת) seems practically certain, and that carries with it others. The text here proposed runs thus, 'And so it fell out that, in the wilderness of Almon, Yeraḥme'el fell upon him and sought to slay him. And Ṣippōrah took a flint-knife and destroyed the sons of Arel at the hill of Rogelim; and she said, I have blotted out the (A)rammites. [Then she said, I have blotted out the (A)rammites, with reference to Ishmael.]'

FIRST DEALINGS WITH THE OPPRESSOR
(Ex. v. 1-vi. 1)

Let me here inquire once more,[1] 'Is it likely that two Hebrews should have had colloquies with a king so fenced in by etiquette as the king of Egypt? . . . There is no evidence that the writer considered Moses to have held a rank in Egyptian society which facilitated his admission, together with Aaron, before Pharaoh.' It may also be asked, Would the phrase חג יהוה (cp. *v.* 1, x. 9) have been intelligible to an Egyptian king, the underlying notion of a *ḥag* (see *E. Bib.*, 'Dance,' § 3) being specially Arabian? Another phrase which suggests that Egypt was not originally

[1] 'Testing Biblical Passages,' *Am. J. of Theol.*, April 1905, p. 326.

regarded as the land where the Israelites sojourned underlies the untranslatable אתם ברע (*v.* 19). Most probably this is a scribe's error for אתמול עֵרֶב = ישמעאל ע', 'Arabian Ishmael,' which seems to be a geographical gloss explaining where the sacrifice (*v.* 17) was to be held. 'Arabian Ishmael' was, in fact, the region of Horeb or Sinai. From *v.* 3 (iii. 18, viii. 27) we gather that the most sacred place of the Hebrews was three days' journey in the wilderness. 'Three days' may be a conventional phrase for a short journey (cp. Gen. xxx. 36, Num. x. 33), but even so Horeb or Sinai was certainly more than a short journey from the spot where, according to most recent critics, the progress of the Israelites began.[1] As to *v.* 19, it may be well to add that וַיִּרְאוּ should probably be rendered 'and they (the officers of the benê Israel) feared.' A more radical correction would, however, be welcome.—On the difficulties of the whole story about the straw, reference may be made to W. M. Müller, *E. Bib.*, 'Bricks.'

A FRESH DIVINE NAME (Ex. vi. 2 *f.*)

THIS is the Priestly Writer's statement—so important for Jewish theology—respecting the earliest use of the divine name 'Yahweh.' We are now, he tells us, at the end of a period (the third—see on Gen. xvii.) of history, and the beginning of the new period is marked by the revelation of

[1] Horeb may, however, have been represented in the primitive story as 'three days' journey' from some point in Miṣrim in the wilderness of Shur or Asshur. Note that iii. 1 originally stated that Moses 'led the flock to the wilderness of Ashḥur, and came to the mountain of the Godhead, to Horeb' (see on iii. 1). Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Moses,' § 9.

the name 'Yahweh.' This, it is true, runs directly counter to the evidence of the Yahwist, according to whom the name 'Yahweh' was known to the patriarchs, but it must be remembered that the Yahwist also represents the deity of the Israelites as a compound of Yahweh and an earlier deity called by the Israelites Yerahme'el.

HESITATION OF MOSES (Ex. vi. 10-12; cp. iv. 10-12)

BOTH J and P agree that Moses was not a fluent speaker. P, however, uses a strange and therefore critically interesting expression, עֲרַל שְׂפָתַיִם, 'of uncircumcised lips.' According to Holzinger, this is an edifying reproduction of the sense of iv. 10. Similar phrases are, it is remarked, metaphorically used in Jer. vi. 10, Lev. xxvi. 41, Ezek. xliv. 9, Jer. ix. 25. The last two passages, however, are certainly corrupt; they are among the numerous passages in which ערל and מול are due to corruption (cp. on iv. 24-26, Josh. v. 2 *ff.*). Moreover, the argument that Moses is not eloquent has already been offered by him in iv. 10 (J) as a reason why he should not be sent to the Israelites, whereas in vi. 12, 30 (P), it is clearly a new and special reason why he should not be sent to the king of Miṣrim that is given. It should also be noticed that Aaron, in P, never displays his capacity for speech before the king; indeed, speech is not required, for Moses is (according to P) to come before 'Pharaoh' clothed with divine omnipotence, and Aaron to be simply his agent. What, then, was a possible reason why Moses should hesitate to go before 'Pharaoh'? Surely the fact that he belonged to the oppressed people. Now ערל in Judg. (xiv. 3, xv. 18), 1 S. (xiv. 6, xvii. 26, 36, xxxi. 4), and 2 S. (i. 20) is a

synonym for פלשתי (פלתי), and the Philistines of the O.T. are a N. Arabian people. So too are the Ṣarephathites or Ṣephathites. Another form of צפת is שפט (see on 1 K. xix. 16). Possibly, therefore, we should read [צפתי] ואני ארלי, *i.e.* 'seeing that I am an Arelite [Ṣephathite].' That Moses in the original story was connected with the Ṣarephathites is probable from ii. 21 (Ṣippōrah). That he was an Arelite, *i.e.* Yerahme'elite, follows from his Israelite origin, probably too from his name (see on ii. 10).

GENEALOGICAL LIST (Ex. vi. 14-25, P)

In *v.* 17 note 'Libni' and 'Shim'i'; group the one with 'Laban' (Gen. xxviii. 2), and the other with Shema = Ishmael.—In *v.* 18 עמרם[1] should be grouped with אברם. The meaning 'in good condition' (Nöldeke, *E. Bib.*, 'Names,' § 77) is surely improbable. For עם (from עמר) cp. עמרה (place-name) and עמרי (Omri); אֶרֶם = רם. The name Amramu occurs in an Assyrian deed (Johns, *Deeds*, iii. 81).—יצהר. See on צחר, Gen. xxiii. 8.—עזיאל, probably from עזריאל; study the occurrences of עזר (clan-name), and cp. *E. Bib.*, col. 5240, note 1. In *v.* 19 מחלי is transparent; cp. on מחלת, Gen. xxviii. 9. מושי, cp. on משה (ii. 10).

Special interest attaches to 'Yokebed,' the aunt of Amram and mother of Aaron and Moses (*v.* 20, P). The name (יוכבד) must go with איכבוד (1 S. iv. 21). Both probably come from יעקב־רם, 'Jacob of [A]ram' (see on 'Akbor,' Gen. xxxvi. 38). The usual analysis—יו = יהו, and

[1] Cp. עמרן, Aramaic; עמרו, Sinaitic (Cooke, p. 199).

כבד = כבוד, 'glory'—has wrong presuppositions[1] (cp. Nestle, *Eigennamen*, pp. 77 *ff.*; Gray, *HPN*, p. 156). On יעקב, see on Gen. xxv. 26.—*V.* 21. קרח, see on Gen. xxxvi. 5.—זכרי, from the clan-name זכר, a variation of זרח (Zeraḥ); cp. on Gen. xxxviii. 30.—*V.* 22. מישאל, from ישמעאל; cp. מיכאל from ירחמאל.—אלצפן. אל shortened from יאל = ירחמ'. צפן, a N. Arabian region (see on xiv. 2).—סתרי, like סתור (Num. xiii. 13), from אסתר = אשתר.—*V.* 23. אלישבע, not 'God swears' (as Nöldeke, doubtfully, *E. Bib.*, col. 1279), but from אל = יאל (see above), and ישבע = ישמעאל.—עמינדב, from [ר]עמ (see above), and נדב = נודב (1 Chr. v. 19).—נחשון, either 'little serpent' (*E. Bib.*, 'Names,' § 68), or rather a corruption of נחשתן, *i.e.* Ashḥur-ethan (formative נ prefixed). Cp. נחשתא (2 K. xxiv. 8).—אביהוא, perhaps corrupted out of אביהו (*i.e.* Arab-yarhu), so as to produce '(my) father is He.' $\mathfrak{G}^{A}$, however, gives *αβισουρ* (אביצור), and $\mathfrak{G}^{BL}$, *αβιουδ* (אביהוד).—אלעזר from יאל (= ירחמ') and the clan-name עזר (see above).—איתמר, parallel to איזבל and איעזר, and therefore = ערב־רמת (אבי = אי). See on Gen. xxxviii. 6.

V. 24. First among the sons of Ḳoraḥ stands אסיר (as if 'prisoner'). The name meets us again in 1 Chr. iii. 17, apparently as an appendage to יכניה, but really it is the first part of the compound name rightly read as אשור אשתאל. Similarly, in Isa. x. 4 אסיר comes from אשור, also here.—אלקנה, from אל = יאל, and קנה, connected with the tribal name קין. Cp. also קֵנָת, Num. xxxii. 42.—אביאסף, not 'my father has gathered' (*BDB*), but, in accordance with parallels (see on Gen. xvii. 5), from ערב־אסף, 'Asaphite Arabia.' אסף is a N. Arabian clan-name (see on 'Joseph,' xxx. 24).

V. 25 *a* should be quoted in full. 'And Eleazar, son of Aaron, took him one of the daughters of Puṭiel to wife; and she bare him Pîneḥas.' Puṭiel occurs only here. It is usual to regard it as half Egyptian, half Semitic. Puṭiel will thus mean 'he whom El has given'; cp. Potiphera',

[1] According to Hommel (*Gr.* p. 95), אי in I-kabod, I-tamar, I-'ezer, I-šai, represents the Sumerian name of the moon, Ai, which was Semitised into Yâu. Thus אי in I-kabod and Yo in Yo-kebed will be equivalent. Again, wrong presuppositions.

if this really means 'he whom Ra has given' (but see on Gen. xxxvii. 36). This accords with the explanation of Pîneḥas given by Egyptologists. Yet it is to be unhesitatingly rejected. 1. None of the O.T. names given formerly by Nestle and the present writer,[1] and lately by Nöldeke (*E. Bib.*, 'Names,' § 81), as having an Egyptian origin are rightly thus accounted for. Ḥur, for instance, is not = Horus,[2] but shortened from Ashḥur (which, of course, is not = 'man of Horus'). Pashḥur (Jer. xx. 1, etc.) comes from Pad-ashḥur, or the like.[3] Aḥira (Num. i. 15, etc.) is not 'a brother is Ra,' but (see Pesh.) a corruption of Aḥida (see on Abida, Gen. xxv. 4). A cultus of Ra as רע among the Israelites would be astonishing; strong evidence would be needed; רע in Hebrew (need one mention?) means 'evil.' 2. Strong evidence again must be given for explaining פוט in פוטיאל otherwise than פוט elsewhere, which is either a regional or an ethnic name (see on Gen. x. 6). Consequently, when we meet with such Semitic names as Puṭi-Baal, Puṭi-Huru, Puṭu-ilu[4] (an Assyrian royal name = פוטיאל), we are, as it seems to me, bound to interpret Puṭ-Baal (= Yeraḥme'el), Puṭ-Hur (= Ashḥur), Puṭ-El (= Yeraḥme'el) as compounds of two place-names or ethnics. With what right, then, does Holzinger declare that 'of the origin of the name Puṭiel there is no trace'? See further, on Gen. xxxvii. 36, etc., and cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Putiel,' 'Phinehas.'—On Pîneḥas enough has been said already (see on Ṣaphenath-pa'neah, Gen. xli. 45). One may venture to ask Prof. W. M. Müller and those who agree with him, why on their theory 'Pîneḥas' should be preferred to the good Hebrew term 'Kūshī.'

[1] Nestle, *Eigennamen*, pp. 109-113; Cheyne, *Prophecies of Isaiah*, ii. 144.

[2] The many Aramaic names into which פמ and חור enter suggest caution (cp. Johns, *Deeds*, iii. 166, 537.

[3] See *E. Bib.*, 'Pashhur.' פרעש (usually 'the flea-clan'!), Ezra ii. 3, etc., is probably almost the same name (Par-'asshur).

[4] Johns, *Deeds*, iii. 166.

THE PLAGUES AND EXODUS (Ex. vii. 8-xi. 10, xii. 29-40)

A COMPOSITE narrative of the wonderful plagues and other occurrences, by which partly the Miṣrite magicians are proved to be inferior to Moses and Aaron,[1] partly the king and his people are touched in their live property or in their own persons, till they themselves, to avoid a worse evil, hurry the Israelites out of the land. The text has been worked over by different hands, and the origin is not very easy to discover. Most probably, however, the original idea of the plagues is derived from Babylonia (*KAT*[3], pp. 552 *f.*), where plagues are closely connected with the deluge. Jensen[2] may indeed go too far in tracing the direct origin of the Miṣrite plagues, but without this theory in a more modest form we can hardly account for the highly improbable narrative in Exodus.

Prof. Ed. Meyer,[3] however, takes a different view. According to him, the earliest narrator confined himself to three plagues[4] (frogs, insects, and locusts), or even to a single plague—the locusts. He thinks that the story of the first Yahwist ran thus. The king is required to let the people go. He refuses, and the locusts are sent over the whole of מצרים except Goshen. The king, under compulsion, gives way, and the land is thereupon freed from the locusts. The Hebrews prepare to set out, the women borrowing festival dresses and ornaments from their Miṣrite neighbours and housemates, on the pretence that

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Serpent,' §§ 2, 3; *PEFQ Statement*, Jan. 1905. p. 34.

[2] *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*, pp. 137 *ff.*; cp. Gressmann, *Eschatol.* pp. 172 *ff.*

[3] *Die Israeliten*, pp. 30, 31.

[4] Cp. the 'great plagues' in Gen. xii. 17.

they will very soon return. The king, who knows better, pursues after them, and meets his end. From the fact that iv. 22 *f.* speaks of 'thy first-born' (*i.e.* the king's), our critic (p. 37) infers that originally it was only this one child whose death was related—not by the first but by the second Yahwist (J^2).

I am afraid that this is not a very satisfactory hypothesis. Is it not clear that if the people of Israel is Yahweh's 'first-born son,' the Miṣrite people as a whole is the intended though unexpressed antithesis? The king's son may, of course, represent his people. Nor can I think it certain either that in the original exodus-story nothing was said of the death of the first-born, or that the drowning of the Miṣrite king in the 'Sea of Reeds' (Meyer's rendering of *yam-suf*) is a historical tradition, or that the land of מצרים from which the Hebrews departed was Egypt. On the second and third of these points I shall speak at more length later. Suffice it to remark here that the drowning of a king of Egypt is not recorded in the Egyptian monuments, and that a N. Arabian sojourn has already found confirmation from the textual criticism of Exodus.

That there is something uniquely strange about the last of the plagues (according to J and E) is undeniable. It is difficult not to connect it with the sacrifice of firstlings to the goddess or god of fertility which was customary among the nomadic Semites (cp. Ex. xiii. 11-16, xxii. 28 *f.*, xxxiv. 19 *f.*). We may presume that this festival was also kept up in Miṣrim,[1] although the Miṣrites in general had passed out of the pastoral stage into the agricultural; and further, that among the firstlings sacrificed were those of men. It is not impossible, therefore, that the narrative in Ex. xii. 29-36 is based on a tradition of this fact. 'The clans of Israel, it may have been said, came out from Miṣrim, from the house of the Arabians (see on xiii. 3), because Yahweh had told them not to go on sacrificing their first-born sons, but to redeem them (Ex. xiii. 11 *ff.*). There was a time when the divine voice had spoken other-

[1] I assume here, provisionally, that the N. Arabian reference of the original story has been sufficiently made out.

wise (cp. Gen. xxii. 2); but now that voice bade them leave their native land, like Abraham, rather than persist in an antiquated and undesirable religious practice. When the story of the peaceful exodus from Miṣrim (Muṣri) was transformed into the story of an exodus in trembling haste "from the land of Miṣraim (Egypt), from the house of servants," it became necessary to reshape the old tradition, so as to make the slaying of the first-born of the Egyptian Miṣrites the punishment inflicted upon the foreign oppressors by the offended Yahweh.'[1] In a word, it is not one of the plagues of the original scheme.

A N. Arabian sojourn finds fresh confirmation here and there even in the story of the plagues. The camels, for instance, in ix. 3 would be unsuitable in a tale of ancient Egypt (see on Gen. xii. 16). Then, turning to textual criticism, we cannot omit the famous התפאר עלי (viii. 5), which we must not, with *BDB*, paraphrase 'assume the honour over me to decide,' nor, with Baentsch, 'deine Majestät geruhe mir zu befehlen,' as if Moses had the tongue of an accomplished courtier.[2] Evidently the text is corrupt, and the only correction which sound method and a due regard for parallels suggest is probably אפרת יעל (cp. 'abrek,' Gen. xli. 43). The initial ה in התפאר I take to be a dittograph; עלי comes from יעל, which, like יאל, may represent either ישמעאל or ירחמאל. 'Ephrath-Yerahme'el' may be the name of the region in which the contemplated sacrifice (*v.* 8) was to be offered. Clearly this and similar geographical terms agree better with a sojourn of Israel in Miṣrim than in Miṣraim. It is specially remarkable that the gloss 'Ephrath-Yerahme'el' should occur in a section (the frogs) which may seem to most marked out as Egyptian.[3]

Nor must I pass over the difficult passage, Ex. viii. 22, which is really made up of two variants. In *a*, Moses says, 'Shall we sacrifice the abomination of Miṣrim to our God

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Plagues, the Ten,' § 5.

[2] 𝔊 could easily have given a Greek court-phrase, but simply renders *τάξαι πρός με*.

[3] Cp. Ed. Meyer, p. 30, note 3. Yet if the original narrator, rightly or wrongly, regarded N. Arabia (or part of it) as a well-watered land, he could of course introduce a plague of frogs.

Yahweh?' In *b*, Shall we sacrifice, etc., to Yerahme'el,' with a gloss, 'Surely Ashkal (= Asshur-Yerahme'el).' Thus, for לעיניהם read לירחמאל, and for ולא יסק' read הלא אשקל. The הֵן, which is supposed to be late Hebrew, is non-existent; נ is dittographed.

Another example of an underlying reference to Yerahme'el is to be found in x. 21, where *BDB* renders וימש חשך 'that one may feel the darkness'; indeed, 𝔊 has already given *ψηλαφητὸν σκότος*. Surely this cannot possibly be right. Grammatically possible, it is nevertheless a strained expression such as no classical Hebrew narrator would have used. Read הוא ישמעאל אשחר, a gloss on ארץ מצרים. וימש = הוא ישמע'; cp. on אמש, Gen. xxxi. 29. חשך, from שחר[א]. Note that in Ps. lxxviii. 51, ci. 23, cvi. 21 *f.*, 'Miṣrim' and 'Ḥam,' and in Hos. ix. 3 'Miṣrim' and 'Asshur,' are parallel.

It has already been suggested that the exodus may originally have been represented as a peaceful one. This, in fact, seems to give the best key to the borrowing of festival dresses and ornaments, which is three times referred to in our present narrative (iii. 21 *f.*, xi. 2 *f.*, xii. 35 *f.*). The action of the Miṣrite women is ascribed to a kindly feeling produced by Yahweh, and we may hesitate to admit that the forcible detention of the Israelites was historical. Surely 'it is as friends that the Miṣrite and the Israelite women part. They have long been neighbours or even housemates, and the Miṣrites who stay behind do not grudge their precious jewels to their departing friends.'[1] There was no 'spoiling' of the Miṣrites in the original tradition, just as there was no drowning of 'the Pharaoh' in the 'Red Sea.'

It is even possible that a number of Miṣrites (*i.e.* N. Arabians) accompanied the benê Israel on their journey. It is, I know, customary to say that the persons spoken of in xii. 38 were a medley of different races, including even Egyptians. But this is due to two false presuppositions, (1) that wherever at all possible the points are to be followed, and (2) that עֶרֶב 'Arabia,' does not occur in the older literature.

If, however, we practise ourselves habitually in the

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Moses,' § 11.

correction of the MT. (points and letters), and in the recovery of an older underlying text, we shall at once see that those who 'went up with' the Israelites were not at all a mere rabble ('viel Gesindel,' Baentsch), but Arabians. Apart from the doubtful passage, Isa. xxi. 13, עֲרָב, Arabia, may occur in MT. only in late passages, but, in the present backward state of textual criticism, this is far from decisive. Read, therefore, עֲרָב; רב in MT. is a dittograph, and compare *Crit. Bib.* on 1 K. x. 15, Jer. xxv. 20, l. 37, Ezek. xxx. 3, Neh. xiii. 3.[1] We now understand Lev. xxiv. 10, where the Miṣrite spoken of is, of course, *not* an Egyptian. Moreover, we have now the key to the enigmatical word אספסף, Num. xi. 4, which should be אספים, 'Asaphites' (cp. on 'Joseph,' Gen. xxx. 24). That these N. Arabians were sometimes troublesome is not strange; indeed, in Num. xi. 4 it is distinctly stated. The Asaphites, we are told, longed for 'the corn which we used to eat in Miṣrim'[2] (the fish and vegetables spoken of are imaginary[3]), and underneath the following words we find the ethnics 'the Ashḥurites, the Rehobothites, the Haṣorites (a section of the Ashḥurites?), and the Ishmaelites (represented twice). Num. xvi. 2 may also be referred to in this connexion. For 'men of name' we should read 'men of Ishmael,' a gloss on 'sons of Israel,' which should be 'sons of Ishmael.' Also Num. xx. 10, where the original story may have had חמרים = ירחמאלים. The mutinous element in the 'congregation' was largely Yeraḥme'elite. Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Moses,' § 15.

We have next to study what is here (xii. 37) stated of the number of the Israelites who departed. This is put down at '600,000 men, foot-passengers—the men, apart from women and children.' The same 'colossal sum' (Baentsch) is presupposed in xxxviii. 26, Num. i. 46, ii. 32, xi. 21,

[1] I recognise no distinction between the passages in which MT. gives עֶרֶב and those with עֵרֶב. Notice that 2 Chr. ix. 14 has עֲרָב, though in the parallel (1 K. x. 15) we have עֵרֶב. In Neh. xiii. 3 Ed. Meyer himself does not hesitate to read עֲרָב (*Entstehung des Judenthums*, p. 130).

[2] For בשר read שבר, and for דגה read דגן.

[3] All the supposed names of vegetables except חציר are ἅπ. λεγ., and חציר itself nowhere else means 'leeks.' Here, indeed, it means neither 'leeks' nor grass, and really comes from חצור = אשחור.

xxvi. 51. But experience has so often proved adverse to the traditional numerals in such passages that we may here too suspect the numerals to be erroneous. מאות, in fact, has sometimes almost certainly come from אתמו׳, *i.e.* אתמול = ישמעאל, and שש from אשור. I take it, then, that שש מאות most probably represents אשר ישמעאל; the prefixed כ has the effect of converting אשר into אשחר;[1] 'Ashḥur-Ishmael' is probably a geographical gloss on 'Raamses' and 'Sukkoth,' both which places, according to the scribe, were in the Ashḥurite region. For the rest of the statement P presumably is responsible. 'About 600' was clearly not enough; so he added something, but that something was, to our thinking, far too much.

On the duration of the sojourn an equally strange statement is given (*v.* 40). 𝔊 and Sam. seek to mitigate its difficulty by inserting 'and in the land of Canaan,' which is plainly wrong; the former also gives 435 years for 430. These numbers evidently take the place of the 400 years in Gen. xv. 13 *b*. Of course, all the numbers are equally inconsistent with the genealogical representation in Ex. vi. 16 *ff*. How, we naturally ask, did they arise? Well, we have seen already (on Gen. *l.c.*) how 400 arose. As to the 430, it appears that the text of the passage which now stands as Gen. xv. 13 must, in the copy used by P, have contained the words שלשים שנה ו prefixed to ארבע מאות שנה. Also, that both these words and those which follow must have a similar origin, *i.e.* that they are corrupt, and come from ethnics, or rather, in the case of '430,' an ethnic, viz. ישמעאלים (dittographed). P, however, as I have already hinted, had the text of Gen. *l.c.* in a corrupt form, and inferred from it that the sojourning of the Israelites in Miṣrim (Muṣri) was 430 years. With his usual precision, he makes the Exodus take place the very day on which the 430 years came to an end (*v.* 41).

[1] Cp. אביש and שישק, both = אשחור.

ABOUT THE PASSOVER (Ex. XII. 42-XIII. 10)

BUT we have not yet done with this energetic writer. He, or rather some writer of his school, not only provided riddles as to the number of the Israelites and the duration of their sojourn which must soon have occupied the minds of Jewish students, and which still exercise the acumen of Christian critics; he has also extracted an edifying exhortation from two corrupt glosses, which he has very honestly prefixed to his own little homily. The glosses, as they now stand, are ליל שמרים and הוא ליהוה, but originally they were יריל שכרם[1] and הוא ירחמאל. 'Yerîl Shakram' is most probably an additional gloss on רעמסס סכתה (*v.* 37). ליל, ילל, אליל, and ירואל (whence יריל?) are all current corruptions of ירחמאל; I lay no stress, however, on יריל—those who like may keep ליל. שמרים is obviously wrong; it occurs nowhere else, and the critics have trouble to find a meaning. Let us trace its probable history. First, an early scribe, for clearness' sake, appended the gloss 'that is, Yerahme'el.' ירחמ', it should be noticed, underlies the existing ליהוה. This came down to the later P in a corrupt form, who thereupon not only gave it its present unsuitable place, but inserted in *v.* 42 *a* להוצ' מארץ מצ', and then added, in *b*, a fresh gloss, הוא הלילה וגו', partly made up of some of the words by this time existent in *a*. This involved the creation of the new and difficult word שִׁמֻּרִים (out of שכרם). We thus obtain, first a new textual confirmation of the N. Arabian theory, and next a clearer view of P's little homily, 'This night is for [= in honour of] Yahweh, an observance (?) for all Israelites in successive generations.'

[1] The possibility of the confusion of מ and כ needs no elaborate proof.

In chap. xiii. 3-10 we have a second ordinance respecting the feast of Maṣṣōth (cp. xii. 14-20). It begins with a command to remember the day of the exodus, because of the proof which God then gave of His might and of His protective care of His people. A reason why no leavened bread should be eaten is not propounded; we are left to imagine one for ourselves (see xii. 34, 39). One phrase, however, in *v.* 3 deserves attention; it is this—'ye came out from Miṣrim, from the house of slaves (עבדים).' Who were the 'slaves'? Parallelism requires us to answer, the Miṣrites. This, however, gives a wrong sense. The phrase occurs again in *v.* 14, xx. 2, Dt. v. 6, vi. 12, vii. 8, viii. 14, xiii. 5, 10, Josh. xxiv. 17, Judg. vi. 8, and is plainly inaccurate. The right reading is מבית ערבים, 'from the house (or, territory) of the Arabians.'[1] That one of the synonyms for 'Miṣrim' was 'Arab-Yeraḥme'el' we have found already. Another (see below) was 'Ashḥur-Arâb.'

The connexion, however, between *v.* 3 and *v.* 4 is not obvious; 𝔊 vainly tries to make one. But there is only one way to remove the difficulty—that which is suggested by experience of recurrent types of corruption. There are passages in which חדש and אביב are corruptions of אשחר and עֲרָב respectively.[2] Let us assume, reasonably enough, that this is the case here, and read, 'To-day ye come forth (not, in the month Abib, but) from Ashḥur-Arâb (מֵאשחר עֲרָב).' The meaning of *v.* 4 now becomes clear; it is an explanatory gloss on *v.* 3 *a.* 'Remember this day on which ye have come out . . . from the house of the Arabians,' and 'To-day ye come forth from Arabian Ashḥur,' are equivalent. *V.* 5 attaches itself equally well to either statement, 'When your longings are fulfilled, and ye enter the land of the Canaanites, etc., be sure that ye eat maṣṣōth.' The probability is that the Deuteronomistic redactor, whose hand is very visible in *v.* 5, already read corruptly בחדש אביב, and with reference to this wrote the words (*v.* 5, end) בחדש הזה.

[1] See *E. Bib.*, col. 3212.

[2] The phrase occurs again in a gloss (xvi. 3).

THE FIRSTLINGS (Ex. xiii. 11-16)

YAHWEH'S requirement of the firstlings (cp. *vv.* 1 *f.*, P). One point has been rather too carelessly treated. In *v.* 12 פטר שגר (separated by Paseḳ) is plainly not right. A late word שגר may no doubt exist (Ecclus. xl. 19), meaning, perhaps, 'young of beasts,' but in Dt. vii. 13, xxviii. 4, etc., שגר אלפיך is parallel to עשתרות צאנך, an impossible phrase, which should certainly be עש׳ צבעון, a regional name. Beyond doubt שגר in all these passages comes from גְּשֻׁר, *i.e.* אשחֻר, a gloss on האדמה or אדמתך, and אלפיך from יר[ח]באל = ירחמאל. In our passage (xiii. 12) the superfluous גשר or אשחר is most probably a gloss on ארץ הכנעני (*v.* 11), suggesting that the original Canaan was in the far south of Palestine.

DIFFICULT PROBLEMS (Ex. xiii. 17-19)

פלשתים may, here at any rate, be correct, although an anachronism (cp. on Gen. xx.). But what of the ים סוף? The difficulty of this phrase is so great that it is not strange that the correctness of the reading has been doubted. No solution of the problem seems to me so satisfactory as this —that *vv.* 17-19 have been recast, and that the original

narrative simply said that when Pir'u (not Pharaoh) had let the people go, Elohim caused them to turn on the way to the wilderness, towards Yaman-Ṣarephath. It will hardly be denied that the excuse offered in *v.* 17 is in the manner of later students of Scripture. My proposal to substitute Yaman-Ṣarephath for the doubtful Yam-Suph is based chiefly on these two grounds, (1) that it has been shown to be probable that the place of sojourn of the primitive Israelites (or of a large part of them) was in the land of Miṣrim, adjoining the land of Yeraḥme'el (in its narrower sense), and (2) that Yam-Suph cannot be satisfactorily explained from a conservative textual point of view. Our new Hebrew Lexicon (*BDB*, *s.v.* סוף) does indeed incline to render ים סוף 'sea of rushes, or reeds,' and W. M. Müller remarks that 'the fresh-water Timsāḥ-lake with its large marshes full of reeds, exactly at the entrance of Goshen, would fulfil all conditions for the exodus and for the Hebrew name.' But our valued Egyptologist adds, that 'still it would be very strange if the Crocodile Lake, or other swamps on the frontier of N.E. Egypt, should have furnished a name to the whole Red Sea, including the Ælanitic Gulf, which was nearer to most Palestinians than the Egyptian lakes,' and that in his opinion 'this theory must be rejected,' so that 'the Hebrew name remains obscure.'[1]

As a 'less probable' alternative to 'sea of rushes' our new lexicon gives 'sea of (the city of) Suph.' In fact, in Dt. i. 1 (according to MT.) Suph, and in Num. xxi. 14 Suphah, occur as place-names. Both passages, however, are corrupt, סוף having probably come from סרף, and סופה from סרפת; the ultimate, correct form appears to be צרפת.[2] It may also be repeated here that ים is often an abbreviation of ימן (= ירחמאל), see *e.g.* Job iii. 6, 8, where כמרירי יום and ארדי יום respectively come from כַּמְרֵי ימן and ארדי ימן (יום = ים). It is quite possible, therefore, that the primitive tradition spoke of some great event affecting the benê Israel in

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Red Sea,' § 2.

[2] In Dt. *l.c.* two readings exist side by side, only there has been a slight transposition; these are במדבר צרפת and בַּעֲרַב ישמעאל (מול = either ישמעאל or ירחמאל). For סוף = צרפת cp. ספרת, Neh. vii. 57, and קרית־ספר, where ספר = [צרפ]ת.

Yaman-Ṣarephath. None of the older writers known to us, except J and E, refer to the passage of the Yam-Suph, though right method will not allow us to lay too much stress on such an argument.[1]

But before passing on, I must at least mention, without giving it my adhesion, the plausible theory of Winckler,[2] that the Yam-Suph, like the 'ark of bulrushes' and the waters of Marah, originally had no existence outside the mythic wonder-land to which we are introduced in Gen. ii. Even if we reject this theory (presupposing as it does the correctness of יָם, 'sea') we need not deny that the legend of the passage of the Yam-Suph is influenced by the myth of the cleaving of the dragon Tiâmat. The identification of the king of Miṣrim with the dragon is, in fact, most probably much older than Ezekiel, the first author known to us who expressly refers to it[3] (Ezek. xxix. 3-6, xxxii. 2-8), though later, of course, than the original story underlying our J and E.

Note also an apparent inconsistency. The people are in danger of being terrified at the warlike Philistines. Yet they go up 'in battle array' (*BDB*). But how, we must ask, does this meaning come out for חמשים? 𝔊, here at any rate, renders πέμπτῃ γενεᾷ. This may suggest to us to group xiii. 18, Josh. i. 14, iv. 12, Judg. vii. 11, and, as most will add, Num. xxxii. 17, with certain other passages in which MT. reads חֲמִשִּׁים, 'fifty.' In both sets of passages the points are wrong, and have to be similarly corrected (see on Gen. xlvii. 13-26). Evidently a letter has dropped out —a matter of frequent occurrence both in personal and in place-names of composite origin. In some of the passages either רמחשים or חשמנים (Ps. lxviii. 32) will do perfectly well. In 1 K. xviii. 13, for instance, the prophets concealed by Obadiah would naturally be men of Ashḥur-Yerahme'el, and in 2 K. i. 9, Isa. iii. 3, the Ḥashmannim, like the Kerethim, would be a standing force of N. Arabians. In others, we may, it appears, suppose that the short form חמשים had

[1] See Baentsch, *Ex.-Lev.* p. 117.

[2] See *Gesch. Isr.* ii. 92; cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Moses,' § 10; 'Red Sea,' § 2, end.

[3] Isa. li. 10*b* (see Duhm) is an interpolation, and of later date.

become a synonym for חלצים or גברים (see Num. xxxii. 17, Josh. i. 14, iv. 12 *f.*). That, indeed, is most probably the case here (Ex. xiii. 18). The attempt of Winckler[1] to explain חמשים as 'troops,' appealing to the Sabæan, is much less satisfactory, nor can Ed. Meyer be said to have strengthened the case.[2] See further, on Gen. xlvii. 13-26.

THE PURSUIT OF THE ISRAELITES
(Ex. xiii. 20, xiv. 2)

Now as to the geography of the exodus. The first station of the emigrants is סכת, 'Succoth' (xii. 37); the second, אתם, 'Etham,' at the 'end' (קצה) of the wilderness (xiii. 20; so Num. xxxiii. 6). From an Egyptological point of view, and not forgetting to criticise the texts, W. Max Müller inclines to identify Etham with Pithom.[3] But then, it is difficult, he feels, not to identify Succoth with the Egyptian Ṯuku, and Ptolemaic inscriptions appear to identify Ṯuku and P-atum altogether. Is it not possible, he asks, that the original source or sources gave Succoth and Pithom-Etham as names of the same place? I doubt if any of the conflicting views about these stations will hold, but am aware that no other geographical theory can be offered. What I can offer is a tenable explanation of the names.

As we have already seen, an early scribe took great trouble to show where the scene of the exodus lay—it was in 'Ashḥur-Ishmael,' or 'Yeraḥme'el-Shakram' (see above).

[1] *Gesch. Isr.* ii. 162, note 1; cp. *BDB*, *s.v.* חמש.

[2] *Die Israeliten*, p. 501. Meyer sees both in the Hebrew and in the Sabæan (and Arabic) terms a reference to the division of troops into fifties, deriving חמשים from the plural חמִשים.

[3] *E. Bib.*, 'Etham'; 'Exodus,' § 10.

A place called Succoth, or Sakkath, appears from other passages to have been in a southern region, and the true form of the name, both in Gen. xxxiii. 17 and here, is Salekath, which (see on Gen. *l.c.*) indicates that the place was an Ishmaelite or N. Arabian settlement. תם[י]א, 'Etham,' comes from Abi-tĕmōl = Arab-Ishmael. Then, in xiv. 2 (cp. Num. xxxiii. 7) we come to פי החירת, which Flinders Petrie[1] identifies with Paḳaheret. Such an unmethodical course, however, is inadmissible. Experience requires us to group the name with Pi-kol (see on i. 11), Hûr, and Hîrah, and consequently to explain it as ערב־אשחורת (Arabia of Ashḥoreth).

We next come to 'Migdol' and 'the sea.' מגדל occurs also in Jer. xliv. 1, where it is placed in 'the land of מצרים,' and grouped with Taḥpanḥes and Noph and the land of Pathros;[2] also in Jer. xlvi. 14, where it is again a Miṣrite city, and grouped with Noph and Taḥpanḥes. תחפנחס is, in fact, most probably miswritten for נפתחס (from Naphtah-ḥas; see on 'Ṣaphenath-Paʿneaḥ,' Gen. xli. 45); נף in both passages should be omitted as a superfluous fragment of נפתחס.[3] In Ezek. xxix. 10 we also meet with מגדל in connexion with סונה, which, as pointed out on Gen. xli. 45 (Asenath), has the same origin as סין and סיני in xvi. 1, viz. סמן = ישמעאל. הים (which, as the narrative now stands, means 'the sea') comes most probably from ימן or ירחם. On בעל צפן much has been written,[4] but צפן, as has been shown, is a form of צבעון (Gen. xxxvi. 2, 20, 24). The geography of the exodus has, in fact, been based largely on misunderstandings. The subject

[1] *Researches in Sinai*, 1906, p. 204. See, however, W. M. Müller, *E. Bib.*, 'Exodus,' § 15 (no such city as Naville's Pe-ḳerḥet).

[2] In Jer. *l.c.* there are two clauses, a long and a short, both introduced by הישבים; presumably the latter is a later insertion. It is, however, none the less useful as a list of places in מצרים.

[3] 𝔊, in fact, omits 'Noph' in the former and 'Taḥpanḥes' in the latter passage. Cornill's commentary throws no light on the mystery.

[4] See *E. Bib.*, 'Baal-zephon'; *KAT*(3), pp. 357, 479; von Gall, *Altisraelitische Kultstätten*, p. 22; also *E. Bib.*, 'Zaphon,' 'Zephon.' The conjecture of Ebers (*Durch Gosen*, p. 570) that Phœnician sailors here propitiated the god of the north wind, when starting southwards, is too fanciful. Von Gall, too, thinks that Ṣĕphōn means the north wind. But see *KAT*, p. 479.

has been treated from different points of view in the *Enc. Biblica*, art. 'Exodus' (cp. 'Red Sea'). It may be added that Dr. C. T. Beke long ago maintained that Yam-Suph always meant the Gulf of Aḳabah, and that Mount Sinai lay to the N.E. of the head of that gulf.

PASSAGE OF THE YAM-SUPH (Ex. xiv. 5-31)

What, we may ask, was the earliest form of this tradition? An answer is very difficult. Our extant authorities, at any rate, give different accounts. According to J, an east (north-east?) wind drove back the waters of the sea, so that Israel could continue its journey on dry ground. The Miṣrites pursue them, but are unable to attack them because of the pillar of cloud. On a sudden Yahweh looks out of the pillar, and the Miṣrite host turns to flee. Meantime the water returns and swallows up the Miṣrite host. E and P, however, represent the water as dividing at the sign given by Moses; the Israelites go through the passage, while Mal'ak Elohim performs a miracle on the chariot-wheels (*v.* 25), producing a panic among the Miṣrites, and on a sign given by Moses the waters return, and carry away the Miṣrites. It is certainly plausible to suppose that current mythic phrases contributed to the formation of this tale of wonders (see p. 552).

Let us now examine xiv. 5-9. *V.* 5 consists of doublets; *a* says that it was told the Miṣrite king that the people fled (P), and *b* that the king and his courtiers repented of their consent to let the people go (JE). The text at any rate is plain. *Vv.* 8, 9 (P) are also clear, excepting a redactional insertion about horses and chariots. The rest

seems incoherent. First, in *v.* 6, we hear of the king's chariot (sing.); then, in *v.* 7, of 600 choice (?) chariots, and of all the chariots of Miṣrim, on every one of which were *shālîshîm* (?). Is it enough to assign the different statements to different sources? Let us first examine the text. Prof. Paul Haupt would excise ושלשם על-כלו (𝔊 *καὶ τριστάτας ἐπὶ πάντων*) as a later addition suggested by xv. 4 *b*, and just before this to read וְכֹל רַכָּב מ׳. To me this seems not effectual enough, and I differ from the critical presuppositions. Remembering how often the scribes insert glosses to illustrate and explain general terms like עַמּוֹ, and noticing in *v.* 7 several words which elsewhere are found to be corruptions of ethnics, the right course can hardly be doubtful. The real trouble lies in *v.* 7, where, first, as in xii. 37, שש מאות has come from ישמעאל, so that 'and his people he took with him' (*v.* 6 *b*) is glossed by 'and he took Asshur-Ishmael.' Next, רכב בחור (Baentsch, 'Elitewagen') has come from רכב רחוב, which is a gloss on 'his chariot' (*v.* 6); a 'Rehōb chariot' is a first-class chariot fit for the king, and in Gen. xli. 43 is called an 'Ishmael-chariot.' Then comes another gloss on 'his chariot.' That there should be only one chariot seemed improper to a later scribe, who therefore inserted 'in fact (וְ), all the chariots of Miṣrim.' Lastly, ושלשם על-כלו. Nowhere else is the plural of שליש written שלשם, a group of letters which elsewhere is pointed שִׁלְּשֹׁם or (1 S. ix. 22) שִׁלְשֹׁם. Nor can scholars agree as to the meaning of שליש.[1] Probably ש׳ל is a popular corruption of ישמעאל (see on 1 S. x. 11, xviii. 6, 2 S. xxiii. 8); על-כלו seems to be a redactional transformation of a corruptly written ערבאל = ירחמאל (a variant), which will be a gloss either on רחוב or on מצרים. I need hardly remark again that numerals are very often corruptions of ethnics (cp. on חמשים, xiii. 18 *b*).

[1] Cp. P. Haupt, *Beitr. zur Ass.* iv. 583 *ff.*

DIVINE FIERY PILLAR (Ex. xiv. 19)

HERE, at any rate, two sources are clear, *a* coming from E, and *b* from J. Mal'ak Ha-elohim comes, as we have seen (on Gen. xvi. 7, xxi. 17), from Yerahme'el-Yahweh. The pillar of fire and cloud is therefore a theophany (*v.* 24; cp. xiii. 21 *f.*, Num. x. 34 *ff.*). The god of the primitive N. Arabians, and therefore of the Israelites, is specially a fire-god (see p. 33). The fiery appearance startles the Misrite host, and works its ruin.

SONG OF MOSES AND MIRIAM (Ex. xv. 1-20)

IT is certainly possible that *v.* 1 (cp. *v.* 21) is the earliest part of the Song. The date of the poem as a whole need not here be considered.[1] The original writer was, at any rate, well aware that the scene of the legends of Genesis and Exodus was in N. Arabia. Take *e.g.* *v.* 1. סוס ורכבו, what does this mean—'the horse and his rider' (as most), or 'and his charioteer' (as Haupt)? Did the warriors referred to really ride on horseback? 𝔊

[1] Cp. my *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 31 (cp. 177), and especially Bender, *ZATW*, 1903, pp. 46 *ff.*; P. Haupt, *AJSL*, xx. 153 *f.* (1904).

neglects the suffix ו; hence Haupt reads וְרֶכֶב, 'and chariot(s).' Most probably, however, רכבו comes from רכבול, *i.e.* ירחמאל (cp. on בכורו, Gen. x. 15, and on עכבור, Gen. xxxvi. 38), and סוס from ישמעאל (cp. on רעמסס, Gen. xlvii. 11).—In *vv.* 2 *b* and 3 there are several errors which can at length be corrected. The first is simple; יאל = אלי = ירחמאל. More difficult are אלהי אבי and איש מלחמה. Why should Amram's God be referred to? And is not איש מלח׳ elsewhere applied to men only (see Josh. xvii. 1, 2 S. xvii. 8)? Isa. xlii. 13 is, of course, not parallel. As to אלהי אבי, to avoid repetition I may refer to the treatment of phrases in iii. 6, Gen. xxviii. 13, xxxii. 10. We have found that אלהי אביך and אל׳ אבי have come from אל׳ עֶרֶב. It is natural to assume that the case is the same here. איש מלחמה is of course = אַשֻּׁר ירחמאל (many parallels exist). Next, we have ואנוהו and וארממנהו. ארמן, as we have seen (p. 55), is one of the corrupt forms of ירחמאל; ואנו may also, perhaps, have come either from ירחמ׳ or from ישמ׳ (נ, as so often, = ל). הו (twice) represents הוא, 'that is.' Next, איש מלחמה, which represents אַשֻּׁר ירחמ׳, 'Asshur-Yeraḥme'el,' and lastly, שמו = ישמעאל (as Isa. lvii. 15, || עד = עֶרֶב). Thus *v.* 2*b* and *v.* 3 are both made up of glosses on 'Yahweh' and on 'Sus we-rakbal' in *v.* 1, viz. 'this is Ya'el; that is, Yeraḥme'el. The God of Arabia; that is, Yeraḥme'el. Yahweh, Asshur-Yeraḥme'el; Yahweh-Ishmael.' The compound names of the God of Israel have been considered on Gen. i. 26.

Miriam, the prophetess, the sister of Aaron (*v.* 20), answers Moses and the other men who had sung the song (see above). What does her name suggest? Can the moderns be correct in explaining 'Miriam' either as 'rebellious' (מרי) or as 'fat' (מריא)?[1] Surely the name marks her out as a Yeraḥme'elite. The same name is borne by a son (probably) of Yether (= Ashtar), 1 Chr. iv. 17. Like Deborah she was a prophetess (cp. Num. xii. 2). Her grave was at Kadesh (Num. xx. 1). See *E. Bib.*, 'Miriam' (S. A. Cook); Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, p. 92.

[1] Haupt, *AJSL* xx. 152 (1904).

WILDERNESS OF SHUR, ETC. (Ex. xv. 22-27)

CRITICAL analysis here is difficult.[1] We will not enter into it now; but the composite origin of the section must be borne in mind. The three days' march in the wilderness of Shur remind us of the three days' journey in iii. 18, v. 3, and all the more as soon as we have penetrated the mystery of the name 'Shur.' That this has anything to do with 'wall,' as if it meant 'the frontier-wall of Egypt,' is no doubt still asserted, *e.g.* by Ed. Meyer, but incorrectly. Undoubtedly it is a shortened form of Asshur (see on Gen. xvi. 7, xxv. 18), just as *'ahar* in iii. 1 is of Ashḥur. Horeb or Sinai, the most sacred mountain of the Hebrews, where the festival spoken of by Moses was perhaps to be held, was in the wilderness of Ashḥur. It is therefore quite possible that שָׁם, 'there,' in *v.* 25 (*bis*) refers, first, to the legislation of the sacred mountain, and then (note 'he proved them') to the story of Massah. According to Ex. xvii. 7 (if we can trust the statement) Massah and Meribah were the same place, and according to *v.* 6 the rock of Massah or Meribah was on, or by, Horeb.[2]

Whether the stories of Marah and Elim originally had their present setting, is very doubtful. Plainly Num. xxxiii. 8, 9, corresponds to *vv.* 11-14 in the same chapter (the itinerary), while the bitter waters of Marah are essentially as mythical as the land which flows with milk and honey. Winckler[3] has illustrated both by the mythic

[1] See Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, pp. 61-64, 101-103.

[2] Bacon (*Exodus*, p. 92, foot) remarks that 'this Meribah would seem to have been at the foot of Horeb (*v.* 6; cp. Dt. ix. 21).' Baentsch, it is true, regards בחרב in *v.* 6 as a mistaken gloss.

[3] *GI* ii. 93, note 3; cp. Mücke, *Vom Euphrat zum Tiber*, pp. 90, 94; Budge, *Hist. of Alexander*, pp. 96 *f.*

lake (pseudo-Callisthenes, ii. 42) with waters as sweet as honey, beside which Alexander encamped, and parallel to which is the river with waters too bitter to drink (*ib.* iii. 17). The name מרה, however, is not mythical. Like רמה it is really connected with רם[א], *i.e.* the S. Aram; while אילם comes from יאלם = יעלם (Gen. xxxvi. 5). To regard Elim as the plural of אֵל, 'God,'[1] is hardly permissible.

QUAILS AND MANNA (Ex. xvi.)

I MAY be allowed to refer first of all to *E. Bib.*, 'Manna,' 'Quails.' The scene of the events, according to P, is the wilderness of Sin,[2] between Elim and Sinai (*v.* 1). Both 'Sin' and 'Sinai' refer us, as we have seen (on iii. 1, 2), to Ishmaelite territory. In *v.* 4, 'when we sat by the flesh-pots' looks like a later insertion; the account of the quails is worked into the story of the manna. The phrase quoted reminds us, however, of Num. xi. 5, and may possibly be corrupt. Note P's strict conception of the Sabbath (see on Gen. ii. 2, 3).

GIFT OF WATER (Ex. xvii. 1-7)

AGAIN the names cause difficulty. Rephidim, Massah, Meribah[3]—are these places rightly brought together? And

[1] Meyer's view, p. 101.

[2] A wilderness of the moon-god is specially improbable.

[3] On the critical questions connected with Massah and Meribah, see S. A. Cook's art. in *E. Bib.*; cp. also 'Kadesh.' Also Cook, 'Meríbath-Kadesh,' *Jewish Quart. Review*, July 1906.

what do the names mean? To the first question the answer is that there is no reason why the same story should not have been connected with different places. Plainly the story in Num. xx. is identical with that in Ex. xvii. It is, however, also, from our point of view, plain that the place-names really mean practically the same thing, so that they might conceivably have attached themselves to the same place. In רפידם, ידם if correct should represent אֲדֹם, or if it should rather be ירם it should stand for אֲרָם. רפ probably comes either (like עפר) from עֲרָב or from אפרת (cp. on viii. 9 *a*). 'Rephidim' is therefore a comparatively late form, implying that the true meaning had been forgotten. The original meaning was probably either Arab-Edom or Arab-Aram. מסה,[1] like משא (see on Gen. x. 30), comes from ישמעאל, and מריבה through מריבעל from ירחמאל. The name 'Ḳadesh,' with which, in Num. xxvii. 14 (here, however, 'Meribah in Kadesh'), Dt. xxxii. 51 [xxxiii. 2], Ezek. xlviii. 28 [xlvii. 19], 'Meribath' is combined, is more difficult to explain. The sense 'holy' is indeed obvious and familiar, but there is good reason (see on Gen. xiv. 6) to suspect that the original form was Ḥashram (= Ashḥur-Aram), which became first Ḳashdam and then Ḳadesh. Note that in Num. xx. 16 Ḳadesh is said to be a frontier city of the king of Edom, or rather of Aram; cp. *v.* 17, where דרך המלך is probably = ד׳ ירחמאל (cp. 2 S. xiv. 26, Jer. xxxvi. 26). It is possible enough that Ḳadesh (= Ḥashram) was sometimes used as a district-name; hence the phrase (see above) 'Meribah in Ḳadesh.' But, of course, Ḳadesh could be used as a place-name. As S. A. Cook remarks, Ḳadesh seems once to have been regarded as the permanent centre of the people (*JQR*, 1906, p. 750).

[1] Cp. סבלת for שבלת, Judg. xii. 6; and סין from ישמן, xvi. 1.

BATTLE WITH AMALEK (Ex. XVII. 8-16)

THAT Amalekites, *i.e.* the hostile and less cultivated section of the Yeraḥme'elites, should be not far off is natural, for 'Rephidim' (see above) contains, in a corrupt form, the name Aram (*i.e.* Yeraḥme'el). It has been overlooked by commentators that the troublesome מחר (*v.* 9) is an incompletely written ירחם, which is a gloss on עמלק (itself an early corruption of ירחמאל).—In *v.* 9 the sudden mention of Joshua is strange. He was the hero of Timnath-seraḥ, *i.e.* Ethman (Ishmael)-Ashḥur[1] in Ephraim (Josh. xix. 50, xxiv. 30). His name יהוֹשֻׁע, *i.e.* originally ירחו־שוע, also marks him out as a Yeraḥme'elite, just as Ḥûr (also xxiv. 14) is not less plainly = Ashḥur.[2] Cp. אבישוע = ערב־שבע (Sheba = Ishmael).—In *v.* 11 it is the hand which holds the magic staff (cp. x. 21).

And now as to 'Yahweh-nissi' (*v.* 15), where most critics neglect the warning Paseḳ, though Winckler (*Krit. Schr.* ii. 63) changes נסי to נשׂא, and Ed. Meyer (p. 63) sees a reference to Massah. From our point of view the meaning is clear. Following the parallel of יהוה שלום (Judg. vi. 24; see *Crit. Bib.*), read יהוה ישמן, *i.e.* Yahweh-Ishmael, equivalent to Yahweh-Yeraḥme'el, an early name of the God of Israel (see on Ex. xx.). The meaning is that the God whose name is Yahweh-Ishmael has here shown his power over the enemies of his people.[3] Moses, however, remembering how Amalek has broken the covenant

[1] No trace of sun-worship therefore.

[2] A study of the other occurrences of the name Ḥûr is instructive, and makes a connexion with Horus quite unacceptable.

[3] The first attempt to go to the root of the matter is in *E. Bib.* col. 2354 [1901].

of kinsmen, declares that war with Amalek shall never cease—כי מלחמה לי׳ וגו׳. The words unaccounted for—כי־יד על־כס יה—probably represent ירחמאל כסלח, which appear to be two glosses on Ishmael. For the second (כסלח) see on 'Kasluḥim,' Gen. x. 14. Nielsen's explanation of the text-reading is surely too far-fetched.[1]

THE SMOKING MOUNTAIN (Ex. xix.)

THE phenomena of the burning Sinai suggest a volcano. See on iii. 2, with the references to Beke and his successors, among whom it is specially pleasing to notice Prof. Ed. Meyer, because of the frequency with which elsewhere the present writer has had to differ from him. That the burning mountain had been already seen by Moses has, however, been overlooked by this sharp-sighted critic.

THE TEN WORDS (Ex. xx.)

WITH regard to the decalogue, several fresh points seem to deserve attention. 1. יהוה אלהיך here, as in some other passages (especially Gen. xxvii. 20, Dt. xxviii. 58, 1 K. xvii. 12, xviii. 10), has been substituted for ר׳ ירחמאל. This is particularly suggested by *v.* 7, taken in connexion with Dt. xxviii. 58. The name which was not to be misused, the 'glorious and fearful name' which the Israelites were to fear, was not Yahweh-Elohêka, but, in its full form, Yahweh-

[1] *Die altarab. Mondreligion*, p. 154.

Yeraḥme'el (the name of the divine duad). 2. 'Other gods beside me' (so render with 𝔊, against Tg.) alludes especially to Baal (*i.e.* Yeraḥme'el regarded as a distinct deity) and Ashtart. Jastrow (*RBA*, p. 149) also finds an implied reference to a divine triad, but thinks of the Babylonian. 3. שְׁלִשִׁים and רִבֵּעִים (*v.* 5 *b*) are suspicious. The former only occurs in the same or similar contexts, where the levelling hand of the redactor may be presumed, and also in Gen. l. 23; רבעים is quite unique. That שלשים has often come from ישמעאלים we have seen already (*e.g.* on xiii. 40, Judg. x. 4, 1 S. x. 11). It is also clear that רבע in Num. xxxi. 8 has come from עֵרֶב. And it should further be noted that in Dt. vii. 9 *f.* (a parallel passage) nothing is said of the terribly wide range of the divine vengeance. Most probably, therefore, we should read על־ישמעאלים ועל־עַרְבִים, and relegate it to the margin. It tells us that the haters of Yahweh referred to are those hostile Yeraḥme'elites of whom xvii. 6 declares that Yahweh will war against them from age to age. 4. 'The house of slaves' should of course be 'the house (territory) of Arabia'; see on xiii. 3 (p. 549).

ABIB; SEETHING KIDS (Ex. xxiii. 15, 19)

As Baentsch remarks, from כאשר to מצרים is redactional, and to be compared with xiii. 4, where MT. has 'in the month Abib,' but the original reading probably was 'from Ashḥur-Arab.' In xxiii. 15, however, it is plain that we must read either חֹדֶשׁ האביב (as MT.) or חֹדֶשׁ עֵרֶב. The latter was probably the original name of one of the months (see on Ezek. iii. 15, 'Tel-abib,' and cp. ערב = אבי in proper names). Other recorded names of months are Zīw (1 K.

vi. 1), *i.e.* perhaps צבעין (= ישמ'), and Ethanim = Ethmannim (1 K. viii. 2; also Phœn.), and Būl = Yerahme'el (1 K. vi. 38; also Phœn.). Fuller light on these may be hoped for.

Let me now venture to repeat a question already asked elsewhere.[1] It relates to the command 'Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk' (xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 26, Dt. xiv. 21), which reads so strangely in the context. Can our critics still bring themselves to think that some magical broth is intended, the object of which was to fertilise the fields? Or do they feel quite satisfied with Robertson Smith's idea[2] that the passage refers to a heathen form of sacrifice in which milk took the place of blood? Holzinger confesses with regret that 'nothing can be made plain.' Why is this? Surely because most of us refuse to supplement old methods by new. Let us look underneath the text reading, and we shall find this—לא תלבש בגד ירחמאלית, 'Thou shalt not clothe thyself with the garment of a Yerahme'elite woman.'

If the meaning of this be obscure, let critical students refer to Lev. xviii. 3 (point מִצְרַיִם) and Mic. vi. 16,[3] and then turn to Lev. xix. 19, Dt. xxii. 9-11. The former passages are called forth by the constant danger to Israel from Yerahme'elite heathenism; the latter are textually more difficult, and, as they stand, perfectly unintelligible.

There is, I admit, a perfect forest of attempted explanations, but how imperfect they all are! One of the best is that of Steuernagel. This critic supposes that the forbidden practices stand in some relation to the cults of the powers of nature, and may soon have symbolised the fusion of two deities.[4] He quite sees that there must be something very definite in the passage, but he cannot find it out. And to all our critics שעטנז ('perhaps of Egyptian origin,'[5] *BDB*) still remains an unsolved enigma.

The solution, reached by a keener textual criticism, is

[1] *Amer. Journ. of Theol.*, April 1905, pp. 330 *f.*

[2] *Religion of the Semites*, p. 221, note.

[3] Read, for עמרי, ירחמאל, and for אחאב, אשחר־ערב. 'For the statutes of Yerahme'el are kept, and all the practices of the house of Ashhur-Arab.'

[4] Stade too (*Bibl. Theol.* i. 146) divines a background of cultus.

[5] So Dillmann, 'stammt wohl wie שֵׁשׁ aus Aegypten.' But שֵׁשׁ too is misunderstood (see on Gen. xli. 42).

in harmony with that of xxiii. 19, offered above. The Hebrew legislators were profoundly impressed with the religious significance of marriage and of dress. A marriage between the worshippers of different deities would inevitably lead to a fusion of religious practices, and if the wife were a Yeraḥme'elitess the man would certainly adopt the impure cultus of Ashtart; very possibly, too, he might have, ceremonially, to adopt women's attire.[1] In Dt. xxii. 5 such simulated changes of sex are forbidden in general terms; in Lev. xix. 19, as well as in Ex. xxiii. 19, etc., the prohibition is specific. The true reading of Lev. xix. 19 (Dt. xxii. 9-11) appears to be approximately this, 'את־חק' תש' ירחמאלית או ערבית [ירחמאל אשחר] לא־תארש [ירחמאל] ובגד שנערית לא יעלה עליך [ירחמאל]: 'My statutes shall ye observe. A Yeraḥme'elite or Arabian woman [Yeraḥmeel-Ashḥur] thou shalt not betroth [Yeraḥme'el], and a garment of [Yeraḥme'el] a Shinarite[2] woman shall not come upon thee.'

We have thus, I venture to hope, solved the riddle, not only of שעטנז (which should obviously be שנערית), but also of כלאים, which is usually interpreted 'two things of diverse kind,' without any very solid basis, but is really, like חלכאים (Ps. x. 10), חילם, and חלאם (2 S. x. 16 *f.*), from ירחמאל. The gloss-makers were well aware of the influence of the Yeraḥme'elite people on the political and religious history of Israel. Fortunately their glosses found their way into the text.

[1] W R. Smith, *OTJC*[(2)], p. 365; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. 250.
[2] Shinar (see on Gen. x. 10) represents Ishmael-Arâb.

MAL'AK THE GUARDIAN (Ex. xxiii. 20)

It has surprised some that here and in Num. xx. 16 (both passages E) מלאך has neither article nor, as in *v.* 23 (R), suffix. But מלאך is quite correctly treated here as a proper name (see pp. 40, 58). It represents ירחמאל, the name of the N. Arabian deity who formed a second to Yahweh in the divine duad of the early Israelites. How great Mal'ak is appears from *vv.* 21, 22, and yet, as a small step towards strict monotheism, he is represented as 'sent' by Yahweh. Contrast 'Let us make man' (Gen. i. 26) and 'Let us go down' (Gen. xi. 7). Abarbanel well remarks, 'The angel who is here mentioned is the great prince Michael [Yeraḥme'el], the redeemer-angel, whose name is like the name of his Lord (*v.* 21), and who is called the angel of his face.'

MOSES ON THE MOUNTAIN (Ex. xxiv. 12, 18)

Probably the original story did not concern itself with the duration of Moses' stay on the mountain. Following the parallel of 1 K. xix. 8 (see *Crit. Bib.*, pp. 348 *f.*), we should read ויהי משה בהר עֶרֶב, with the glosses (underlying יום and לילה) יָמָן and ירחמאל. Cp. xxxiv. 28, where the words are

added, לחם לא אכל ומים לא שתה. A most unnatural statement, according to Baentsch. Probably, however, it has grown out of glosses containing the names ירחמאל, ימנים, and אשתר, and indicating that the mountain was in N. Arabia. It was neither the fasting of Moses nor the duration of his stay, but the fact that Israel's legislator received his laws from God on the sacred mountain, that interested the earliest scribes or editors. The communication of these laws by Yahweh himself reminds us of Ḫammurabi receiving his Code from the Sun-God. In xxxi. 18, xxxii. 16, we find the phrases, 'the writing of Elohim,' 'written with the finger of Elohim,' which Winckler[1] takes to refer to cuneiform as opposed to Phœnician script. This, however, appears to be a mistake.[2] It is a perfectly naïve way of saying that the 'Mosaic' laws were given by revelation.[3]

FATAL ERROR OF TRANSCRIPTION
(Ex. xxvii. 21)

אהל מועד (note absence of article). The phrase is rendered either 'tent of meeting' or 'tent of revelation.' Neither rendering is supported by tradition, and it would be strange if the 'meeting by appointment' (xxv. 22) of Yahweh and Moses were originally referred to as a מועד; none of the passages quoted by *BDB* affords a parallel for this. If מועד is really the original word, it ought to signify primarily

[1] *AOF*, 3rd ser., i. 168; *Krit. Schriften*, ii. 116.

[2] It is connected with the incorrect reading בחרט אנוש, Isa. viii. 1, which should be בח' ישמן, 'with an Ishmaelite pen.'

[3] Cp. Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, pp. 46 *f.*

a meeting of Yahweh and the other elôhîm.[1] In several of *BDB*'s passages, however, מועד has probably arisen by textual corruption; it is very plausible to extend this supposition to the passages containing the phrase אהל מועד, if we should not rather say that there has throughout been a deliberate alteration of the word which originally stood in place of מועד. What, then, we have to ask, was the original word?

To answer this question, we must take the phrase אהל מועד in connexion with הר מועד in Isa. xiv. 13. In the latter passage we find the king of 'Bābel' boasting that he will take his seat on a mountain in Ṣaphon, *i.e.* Ishmael (see p. 32), called מועד. This arrogant king is (virtually) addressed by the poet as 'Yeraḥme'el ben Ashḥur' (underlying *hêlêl ben-shaḥar*), and made to claim for himself likeness to the Most High. Can we doubt what this mountain is? Plainly it is Ezekiel's 'mountain of Elohim' (Ezek. xxviii. 14, 16), and, as we have seen, the God of Paradise (as well as the first man and his descendants), originally bore the name Yeraḥme'el. Among the shortened forms of this name was רמון (MT. 'Rimmon'); others, most probably, were רעמן and ארמון. The latter would often be written ארמו׳, or, by the common scribal error of transposition, מואר (omitting the sign of abbreviation). An editor, striving after sense, would convert this into מועד, and, being equally bent on uniformity, would harmonise all the passages in which this scribal error מואר could be found. Or the process might be even shorter; ארמו׳ (ארמו) might at once be converted into מועד.

We can now perhaps see more clearly than *BDB* has done into the name of Saul's son Armoni (2 S. xxi. 8, *BDB*, *palatinus*). But also something much more important, viz., how it came to pass that P converted the traditional tent-sanctuary, pitched outside the camp, into a *palatial* structure, which was in two senses central, viz. both as regards its relation to the worship of the early Israelites (as imagined by P) and as regards its position in the camp

[1] So, tentatively, Zimmern, *KAT*[(3)], p. 592; his earlier view (*Ritualtafeln*, p. 88, note 2) was different. Cp. also A. Jeremias, *BNT*, p. 63, note 4; Hommel, *Gr.* p. 170, note 1.

of the tribes. P may, in fact, have interpreted ארמון as 'palace,' whereas the earlier narrator (E) simply took the name *'ohel 'armôn* without attempting to explain it. That נועדתי in xxv. 22 proves the writer (P) to have read אהל מועד, and to have interpreted it 'tent of the appointed meeting,' I cannot think probable.

THE SHEKEL PROBLEM (Ex. xxx. 13)

THE phrase שֶׁקֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ is only found in P; it is supposed to imply that a standard shekel was deposited in the post-exilic temple. It is probable, however, that קדש has sometimes come either from שחר[א] (Ashḥur) or from חשרם (= Ashḥur-Aram); cp. on xxxi. 10, Gen. xiv. 7. And considering that in Gen. xxiii. 9 (P) the most probable text gives the phrase 'money of Yeraḥme'el, in Dt. iii. 11 'the cubit of Asshur,' and in Isa. viii. 1 'a stilus of Ishmael,' it is not too bold in xxx. 13, 24, Lev. v. 15, etc., to restore the phrase שקל אשחר. This is confirmed by Lev. v. 15, where, besides שקל הק', we find the phrase כסף שקלים, which is not 'money amounting to two or more shekels,' but a corruption of כסף אשכלים, *i.e.* 'money in full weight, such as the merchants of Ashkal (see on Gen. xiv. 13) recognise'; and still more by Neh. v. 15, where the difficulties of MT. still puzzle the critics. Let me quote the words, אחר כסף־ שקלים ארבעים. '*Forty* shekels' is improbable, and אחר cannot mean either 'beside' (R.V.) or 'at the rate of' (R.V. mg.). As often (see on Gen. xxii. 13) אחר has come from אַשְׁחֵר, and ארבעים (see on xxiv. 18, Gen. xxiii. 2) from ערבים; both words are glosses on שקלים = אשכלים (Ashkalites). Cp. on xxxi. 10.

WHO WERE THE ARTIFICERS? (Ex. xxxi. 2, 6)

'WHAT'S in a name,' we often say. But names like Beṣalel and Oholiab are of much import. For the former, 'in the shadow of El' seems so edifying a sense, that few, besides Halévy, probably have doubted it. The merit of this keen scholar lies in his having seen[1] that a number of names beginning with בְּ are really mutilated forms of compounds with אב; his error, in interpreting אב or אבי as 'father (of),' whereas it is really a shortened form of אבר or ארב = עֲרָב. I append a list of the chief names (not from Halévy): 1. בצלאל; 2. בסודיה; 3. בעליס; 4. בעשא; 5. בשן; 6. בשמת; 7. בעור; 8. ברשע; 9. בשור; 10. בריעה; 11. ברד; 12. בלשן; 13. במהל; 14. בשלם. Returning now to בצלאל, I would remark that צלאל is to be grouped with צלול (Judg. vii. 13), צללי (Jer. vi. 4), צלצל (Isa. xviii. 1), and צלם (Num. xiv. 9, Ezek. xxiii. 14, Am. v. 26). All these forms are corruptions of ישמעאל. To these we may perhaps add Ṣil in Ṣil-Bil, the name of a king of Gaza, tributary to Esar-haddon[2] (*KB* ii. 149). That both the family of Beṣalel, according to tradition, and that of Oholiab, were considered to be of N. Arabian affinities may be inferred from the names which follow in their genealogies, and the Chronicler confirms it by the statement (1 Chr. ii. 19 *f.*) that Ḥur, the grandfather of Beṣalel, was the son of Caleb and Ephrath. Note that Beṣalel works in silver and gold, and that silver and *perhaps* also (see 1 K. x. 22) gold came from Asshur or Ashḥur (Tarshish).

As for the name Oholiab, its setting (as regards names)

[1] See *REJ* x. pp. 1 *ff.*; Gray's criticism (*HPN*, p. 23, note 4) hardly goes to the root of the matter.

[2] Dillm. and Halévy have already compared בצללאל and Ṣil-Bil.

we have seen to be distinctly N. Arabian. Its meaning is, not 'Father's tent' (so *BDB*), but Yeraḥme'el-'Arâb. Thus the supposed artificer of the so-called 'tabernacle' (A.V., after Vg.) bears a name nearly equivalent to that of the artificer of Solomon's temple in 2 Chr. ii. 12, iv. 16, חירם אבי, *i.e.* חירם עֲרָב.[1] The Chronicler too informs us that Ḥiram-abi's tribal connexion on his mother's side was Danite; the Priestly Writer similarly states that Oholiab was a Danite. The latter is called son of Aḥisāmāk (so MT.), where Aḥi = Ashḥur, and sāmāk is to be grouped with Semakyāhū (1 Chr. xxvi. 7) and Sibbekai (2 S. xxi. 18). Plausible reasons can be given for regarding both these names as N. Arabian.

CLOTHING OF PRIESTS (Ex. xxxi. 10)

THE priestly robes of Aaron and his sons are called בגדי הַשֶּׁרֶד (𝔊, 'garments of service'; *BDB*, 'perhaps garments of plaited work'), and also ב׳ הקדש (so too xxxv. 19, xxxix. 41). Lagarde (*Uebersicht*, pp. 175 *f.*) would delete the ו in ואת, and regard הקדש as an explanatory gloss on the loan-word שרד. The objection is that in xxxix. 1 ב׳ שרד stands alone. The truth may be that השרד is a corruption of שור = אשור, just as הקדש probably is of אשחר. The robes used by the priests in the cultus were possibly, like their knowledge of Yahweh, of N. Arabian origin, and were therefore originally called 'garments of Shur,' or 'of Ashḥur.

[1] חירם seems more correct than חורם. חירם (or אחירם), probably = אשחור ארם. אבי in compound names (elsewhere prefixed) represents עֲרָב (see on Gen. xvii. 5).

THE FACE OF YAHWEH (Ex. xxxiii. 14)

'My Face (*pānīm*) shall go, and I will give you rest.' Cp. xxiii. 20 *f.*, and see p. 279. Penuel or Peniel (xxxii. 31 *f.*) cannot safely be brought into connexion. The Phœnician goddess Tanith, the 'face of Baal,' may, however, justly be referred to, Yerahme'el being most probably a transformation of a goddess (see pp. 45 *f.*).

Here unwillingly a pause in these researches must be made. It seems unwise to attempt the history of Israelitish religion till a much keener criticism has been applied to the text. Should some advanced students have been led to question the soundness of many of the prevalent critical views, and to combine new critical methods with old, it will be a result not wholly inadequate to the long-continued labour represented by the present work.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS AND NAMES

Aaron (Aharon), explained, 521
  not always Moses' brother, 532
Ab, *Abi*, in names, 51, 286, 308, 370
Abdalonymus, legend of, 72 (*n.* 2)
Abd-ḥiba, 224
Abel, significance of, 102 *f.*
Abi in connexion with clan-name or place-name, 408 *f.*
Abib, month, 564
Abijam, explained, 29
Abimael, explained, 27, 199 (with *n.* 3)
Abimelech, explained, 51, 55, 313
  in connexion with Sarah, 313 *ff.*, 321
Abishag, explained, 120, 471 (*n.* 3)
Abi-ummi, explained, 309
Abomination of desolation, 18
Abraham, significance of, 285 *f.*
  name of hero of flood? 300
  name of first man? 307
  his hospitality, 291
  not a missionary, xi., 225, 468
  his intercession, 295
  his faith tested, 323
  as a warrior, 230
  his mental reservation, 314
  his purchase of a family grave, 334 *ff.*
  his death, 350
Abrek, meaning of gloss, 462, 466 *f.*
Achbor, Achshaph, Achzib, Akrabbim, 432, cp. 447
Adam, proper name? 95 *f.*, 116
  his creation, 70
  and Eve, created mortal? 76
Adapa, 13 (*n.* 4), 49 *f.*, 72 (*n.* 1, 2), 73 (*n.* 3), 76 (parallel to Adam), 96 (Adamu?)
Adonai, divine name? 54-56, 314
Adoni-ṣedeḳ, 194
Adonijah, explained, 55
Adonis, myth of, 30 *f.*, 54, 56 *f.* *See* Isaac, Joseph, Tamûz
Adullam, origin of, 446
Ages of the world, 126, 281 *ff.*
Aḫ and *Aḫi*, in names, 29 (*n.* 1), 46, 51, 286, 308
Ahab, explained, 63 (*n.* 4), 286 (with *n.* 3), 308
  his title in Assyrian, 404
Ahura Mazda. *See* Zoroastrianism
Aḫuzzath, explained, 363
Allegory, Gen. iii. 21 *f.*, not an, 74
Allon-bākūth, explained, 417
Almodad, 198
Amalek, explained, 39, 96 (*n.* 3), 424
Amarna tablets. *See* Inscriptions
American myths, creation, 8, 9 (bird-creator) 12
  deluge, 5, 127 *f.*
  gods of the four world-quarters, 13
American peoples or countries, Algonkins, 5, 7, 8, 124 *f.*
  Caingang, 126 (with *n.* 4)
  Guatemala, 127
  Hare Indians, 128
  Lenâpe, 126
  Quiches, 127
  Sioux, 101
  Skidi Pawnees, 12, 72, 118, 124 *f.*
  Tamanaks, 128
  Tlatlasiks, 141
  Tlinkits, 127 *f.*
Am or 'Am, divine name 308 *f.*
'Amm, divine name, 310
Amon, explained, 34, 55 (*n.* 2)
Amorite, and (Ass.) Amurri, 195
Amram, 539
Anak, explained, 121
Angel of Yahwe. *See* Mal'ak Yahweh
Angels, 12 (*n.* 1), 368
Angels, fall of the rebel, 117
  why called Watchers, 117
Animal-gods. *See* Gods (animal)
Animal-men, 15, 117
Animal-names. *See* Totemism

Animals, formation of 72 *f.*
Apepi, mythic Egyptian serpent, 3, 128
Arabia, home of magic, divination, and prophecy, 6, 41 cp. 459-461
Arabia, South, 25 (*n.* 2)
Arabian beliefs, 2, 9, 33, 47, 79
gods, Hobal 103 (*n.* 1); Kuzaḥ, 138; Nergal, 53; Resheph, 23, 57 *f.*, *see* also Yeraḥme'el
Arabian neighbours of Israel, their language, 459
Aram, the southern, 17, 62 (*n.* 2)
Aram-naharaim (?), 263, 342 *f.*, 357, 430
its fine linen, 469
kings of, 428 *ff.*
Aramæan deities, Hadad, 33, 50, 56; Rimmon (Ramman), 25, 27, 55, 66; Rekubel, 101; Resheph, 57
Ararat, geographical meaning, 135, 146
is it correctly read? 135, 141, 144 (with *nn.* 1, 2, 3), cp. 513
Arbela (Arba'-ilu), 335
Ark, Noah's, 132, 137; where it grounded, 131, 135, 144; 'gopher'-wood, 148
of Moses, 520
sacred, 27, 31, 33, 35, 55, 63; Dibelius' theory on, 34 *f.*; artificers of, 571 *f.*
Armon (Arman), divine name, 55, 250
Armon-Yahweh, 33-35
Arnold, W. R. 531 (*n.* 1), on Ex. iii. 14
Arnon, origin of 33 (*n.* 2)
Arpakshad, 178
Asenath, explained, 471
Ashdod, explained, 23, 47, 177 (*n.* 2)
Asher, divine name? 23 *f.*
tribal name, 378
Asherah (Ashratu) a divinity, 24 *f.*, 378
Asherim, symbols of Asher, 24 *f.*
As-ḥor, Egyptian name 23 (*n.* 2)
Ashḥoreth, regional name, 23, 46, 213, 319, 337, 352, 485, and 491 (Joseph-story), etc. Cp. Ashtart.
Ashḥur, explained, 23, 177 (*n.* 2)
Ashkal (Eshcol), explained, 18 (*n.* 4), 23, 40 (*n.* 3), 247, 315
Ashkar, explained, 381
Ashkelon, explained, 23
Ashkenaz, 23, 144, 163
Ashtar, a god, overshadowed by Yerahme'el, 27
the same as Ashḥur, 16, 23, 25, 70 *f.*, 362 (*n.* 3)
combined with Yerahme'el, 70
Kemosh, 277
worshipped in Arabia, 454
mountain of, 146
Ashtart, primitive goddess, 16 *f.*, 21, 23
goddess of wisdom, 27
feast of, 69
Ashtart—*continued*
royal priestess of, 44
titles of, in true Hebrew text, 18-22, 61 (*n.* 1), 448
her sacred animals, 21
development of, 21
a regional name, 51
Ashtarts, the local, 17
Ashteroth Karnaim, 240 *f.*
Asmodeus, 300 (*n.* 1)
Asshur-Aram, 414 *f.*
Asshur or Ashḥur, a regional and a divine name, 23, 355, 357, 530 *f.* (on Ex. iii. 14)
Asshur-passages, 177, cp. 360
Asshur tree, 24, 457
Asshur-Yeraḥme'el, a regional and a divine name, 23, 199, 276, 305, 405, 446 (situation), etc., cp. Baal
name of a mountain and a city, 328
Asshurim, 352
Asshurites (Ashḥurites) in Arabia, 90; in Miṣrim, 517
Ataroth, explained, 46
Atra-ḥasis, 128
Australia. Deluge-myth, 123; circumcision, 534 *f.*
Azazel, explained, 30, 119
Aztec myth, divine serpent, 84

BDB, recorded or questioned, 120 (thrice), 142 (*n.* 1), 143, 145, 229 (*n.* 1), 286 (*n.* 3), 302 (twice), 314, 406 (*n.* 1), 419, 422, 436, 460, 489, 501, 503, 508, 544, 551 *f.*, 565, 572
Baal, origin of divine name, 24, 50
Baal-Ḥammân, 21, 25 (*n.* 1), 50 (with *n.* 5).
Baal-Hazor, 57
Baal-ṣephon, 554
Baal-shamem, 21, 50 (cp. 45)
Baals, the, 17, 50, 62
Bābel, does it always mean 'Babylon'? 187 *f.*
tower of, 201 *ff.*
Babylon, ten antediluvian kings, 111
the 'centre' of the world, 86
step-towers of, 202
Babylonian geography, primitive, 86
gods, myths, and legends, Addu = Hadad, 50; Anu, heaven of, 132, 140; Arallu, 54 (origin); Ba'u = Ishtar, 21 *f.*; Belili, goddess, 53; Belit, 22; creation-story, its slow growth, 2; chief Babylonian creation-story, two local traditions of, 130; creation-story, second Babylonian, 86; two other creation texts, 137; creation of men and animals (Berossus), 12; creation of Adam, 71; of heaven, 11; Ea, god, 13 (*n.* 3), 40, 49, 132, and 295

(patron of humanity); Eabani, 13 (*n.* 3), 72; Etana, myth of, 33; Gilgamesh, 14, 78, 135, 181; Ishtar (*see* Ishtar), 7, 21, 38 (*n.* 2), 59, 77, 136 (bow-star); Ishḫara = Ishtar, 23 (*n.* 3); Kutha, legend of, 118; Marduk, 10 (*n.* 3), 13, 36, 40 *f.*, 76, 278; his weapon, 101; mountain of the lands,' (83 *n.* 4), Nergal, 53 (origin), 54, 68; Oannes, 79; Rammân, 27, 33 (with *n.* 2), 66; Tamûz, a god, 47; explained, 19 (*n.* 3); Yām, a god, 28 *f.*, 50 (*n.* 2). *See* Sargina
Bacon, B. W., 258 *f.*, 559 (*n.* 2)
Baentsch, B., 517, etc.
Baethgen, 24
Balaam, 40 (*n.* 3), 41, 179, 190, 314, 430
Ball, C. J., 467 (*n.* 1), 497, 501, etc.
Bar-ḳos, Bar-nebo, explained, 108 (*n.* 2)
Barton, G. A., x, 17, 23, 24 (*n.* 1), 25, 75, 99, 114
Bashan, explained, 340 (*n.* 2)
Baudissin, Graf von, 51, 54 (*n.* 5), 56, 324 (*n.* 1)
Bdellium (?), 92 *f.*
Beel-zebub, Beel-zebul, 54, 144 (*n.* 2)
Beer-lahai-roi, 270
Beer-sheba, 311 *f.*, 321
Beke, C. T., xii, 30 (*n.* 4), 528
Belial, origin of, 53 *f.*
Belitan, explained, 44
Berossus, 111 (ten kings), 130 *f.*
Bertholet, Alf., 136 (*n.* 2), 260
Beth-aven explained, 516 (*n.* 5)
Bethel, explained, 371
  story of, 367 *ff.*
Bethlehem, explained, 51, 419 *f.*
Bethshemesh, explained, 273
Bethuel, explained, 179
Bilhah, 373
Birdad, N. Arabian name, 182
Bod-Ashtart, Phœnician name, 43 *ff.*
Bohu. *See* Babylonian, 'Ba'u.'
Booths, feast of, an altered name?—18 (*n.* 4), 397
Bosheth, not a substitute for 'Baal,' 18
Bousset, W., 54 (*n.* 3), 75 (*n.* 2), 102 (*n.* 1); 'Addenda.'
Bows of war-gods, 138
Bowstar, *i.e.* Sirius, 138
  = Ishtar, 138 (*n.* 1)
Briggs, C. A., 254 (*n.* 1), 508 (*n.* 1)
Brinton, D. G., 8, 9, (*n.* 6) 84 (*n.* 3), 125 (*nn.* 2, 3)
Brothers, hostile, 356
Burkitt, F. C., 132 (*n.* 1).
Bush, burning, 525 *ff.*

Camels in Egypt, 225
Canaan, original meaning of, 174 *f.*
Canaan—*continued*
  original situation of land called, 85, 550
  Nergal and Rammân worshipped in, 53, 55
  no images of Baal found in, 50
Canaanitish culture, effect of, 62
Canticles, references in, to Adonis-myth, 19 (*n.* 5), 47, 56
Charles, R. H., 119
Chemosh. *See* Kemosh
Cherub, cherubim, 8, 31, 35, 100 *f.*
Circumcision, 283, 290, 411 *f.*, 533 *ff.*
Clement of Alexandria, quoted, 80, 97.
Cook, S. A., 23 (*n.* 2), 318, 334 (*n.* 1), 561
Cooke, G. A., 23, 43 *ff.*, 59, 65, 67, 98 (*n.* 2), 424, 488 (*n.* 2)
Cornill, C. H., 99 (*n.* 4), 177 (*n.* 1), 412, 416, 418 (*n.* 4), 554 (*n.* 3)
Cosmogony, in Gen. i., earlier phases of, 2
  in Gen. i., whence derived, 2
  order of created works in, 12
  Egyptian illustrations, 3
  world-egg, 4, 9 *f.*
  creative spirit, 3
  affinity of, to Deluge-story, 125, 128
Cowley, A., 65 (*n.* 1), 409 (*n.* 2)
Cowper, H. S., 59 (*n.* 1)
Craft, quality of ancient heroes, 365
Crawley, E., 79 (*n.* 3), 80 *f.*, 81 (*n.* 1)
Creation, belief in renewal of, 36
  in early Canaanitish story, 7, 8
Creation-myth, recast of, 65
Creator, theriomorphic, 7, 9, 124
  half-developed, 125
  human personality of, 7, 81 *f.*
  name of, in Gen. ii.-iv., 98-100
  Yerahme'el as, 37 *f.*, 254
  Yahweh as, 65, 254
Cults and myths, migration of, x. 32 (*n.* 2), 43
Cuneiform writing, is it referred to in Ex., 568
Cush. *See* Kush
Cushan-rishathaim, 431

Dan, 376
Daniel, origin of name, 96
  the four beasts in, 282
David, name, connected with Dôd, 48
  his Arabian origin, 432 (*n.* 1)
  his Ishmaelite scribe, 288
  wars of, 507 (*n.* 1)
Deborah, 416 *ff.*
Decalogue, 563 *f.*
Dedan, 176, 352
Delitzsch, Friedr., 86-88, 111 (*n.* 5), 154 (*n.* 1), 352
Deluge, called *abubu*, *i.e.* storm-flood, 134, and light-flood, 142 (*n.* 2)
  a Hebrew legend without, 115

Deluge—*continued*
duration of, 136 *f.*
hero of, 114, 142
of fire or of water, 297
See also Egyptian, Indian, Lithuanian, Peruvian, Phrygian, Polynesian.
Deluge-story, an ether-myth, 140
primitive, shorter and simpler, 137-139
friendly animal in primitive, 126, 138 *f.*
Babylonian (in epic), 132-135; (in Berossus), 130 *f.*
Babylonian epic, meaning of 'ship' in, 134
development of Babylonian, 137-140
Canaanite or N. Arabian, its development, 141
differences between Genesis and the epic, 135, 137
differences between J and P, 135-137
its relation to Sodom-story, 137
references to N. Arabia, 141 *ff.*
Dillmann, Aug., 121, 319, 501, 504, 509, etc.
Dinah, 381, 410 *ff.*
Diod. Siculus, quoted, 450 (*n.*[1]), 460, 489
Dioscuri, 107 (*n.*[1]), 293
Dôd, a god worshipped at Beer-sheba, 37, 46-49, 57, 379
possibly a name of the Messiah, 47 *f.*
a geographical name, 47, 198
meaning of name, 48
Dôdah = Ashtart, 46, 379
Dodanim, 167
Dothan, in the south, 440
Dragon-myth, Babylonian, 3, 6, 123
Egyptian, 3, 130 (Apepi)
omission of, in Gen. i., 3
fate of the monster, 5
in Revelation, 4, 37
elsewhere in O.T., 6
typical interpretation of, 4
Dragon-myths, 6 (in Syria), 41 *f.*
Dragon-slayers, also healers, 41
Driver, S. R., xii, 9, 21 (*n.*[2]), 74, 89, 98 104, 144, 258 (*nn.*[1,3]), 263, 315, 332, 342, 358 (*n.*[1]), 377 (*n.*[1]), 390, 404, 426, 481, 486, 492, 502, 510
Dualism, in creation- and deluge-stories, 125 *f.*
of Revelation, 1
Dûdu, Egyptian official, 48 (*n.*[1])
Duhm, B., 52 (*n.*[1])
Dusares, 325
'Dust,' the phrase 'eating,' 82

Eagle, divine, 9, 21, 33, 35, 78; cp. 101
Earth, limited conception of, 124
Ecclesiastes, supposed Arabian origin of, 40 (*n.*[3])
Edda, divine triad in, 292
Eden, origin of, 86-88
Edom, 358
kings of. *See* Aram
often miswritten for Aram, 429
Eerdmans, B. D., 75, 79 (*n.*[4]), 103 (*n.*[2]), 325
Egypt, tombs of Beni Hasan, 474
supposed Semitic temple in, 16
horses in, 462
embalming in, 512
brick-making in, 516
the Merneptah-stele (Israel) in, 405
Thotmes III., place-list of, 273, 380, 403
Shoshenk, place-list of, 221, 397
Rameses II., 487
Rameses III. (Harris papyrus), 358 (*n.*[2]), 425 (*n.*[1])
Egyptian beliefs—cosmogony, 3, 454 (*n.*[2]); creation of man, 70; Khnumu, the divine modeller, 74; humanity of gods, 15; Deluge-story, 128; destruction of mankind, 128; Isis, 67, 454 (cow); Resheph, deity, 57; birth of divine brothers, 356; Tale of Two Brothers, 74, 292; incarnate Horus, 520. *See* Apepi
Ekron, explained, 109
El, origin of, 68
El-Elyon, origin of, 37 *f.*
Elam, in Gen. x. etc., 177
Eli and his sons, 63
Eliezer-Damascus (?), 258, 260 *f.*
Elijah and Ahab, story of, 41
Elijah and Elisha, N. Arabian origin, 62; cp. 440
Elishah, where situated, 134, 164
Elohim, origin of, 66-69, 99, 400
constructed with plural verb, 314, 390
El-roi, origin of, 276
Enoch, a 'first man,' 14, 49; solar hero, 115. *See* Hanok
supposed Babylonian parallel to, 112 *f.*
Enosh, explained, 111
Ephraim, explained, 472 *f.*
the original mount, 470
Ephrath, 262, 419, 507. *See also* Perath.
Epiphanius, quoted, 325 (*n.*[4])
Erbt, W., 19 (*n.*[7]), 46, 47 (*n.*[1]), 56, 104, 233, 404 (*n.*[4]), 445, 505
Eridu, city of the god Ea, 79, 136
Esau, explained, 358 *ff.*, 405
J's explanation of, 359 *f.*
his wives, 364, 367
his genealogy, 422 *ff.*
Esau and Jacob, story of, 356 *ff.*, 393 *ff.*
Eshbaal and Eshban, 23

Eshmun. *See* Phœnician
Eshmunazar, 43 *ff.*, 68
Eshtaol, 70 (*n.* 3), 110
Esther, explained, 166 (*n.* 3)
Etham, 516, 553 *f.* (explained)
Ethan, explained, 58, 64 (*n.* 2)
Ethbaal, explained, 39 (with *n.* 2)
Euphrates, 91, 263
Eve, meaning of (Ḥawwah), 97 *f.*
  and the apple, 81
  formation of, 73 *f.*; parallels to story, 74
Ewald, H., 316, 367
Exodus, the, 545-547

Face of Yahweh, 279, 573
Finnish mythology. *See* Kalevala.
Firstlings, law of the, 550
Four, sacredness of number, 28 *f.*
Frazer, J. G., 429

Gabriel, 102 (*n.* 1), 293
Gad, tribal name, 378
Gautier, Luc., 297
Geiger, Abr., 119, 414 (*nn.* 2, 3), 492
Gemini, the, 273, 356, 501
Gerar, situation of, 311; cp. 363
Gershom, explained, 524
Giesebrecht, Fr., xi, 496
Gihon, river of Paradise, 92
Gilead, 179, 385 *ff.*
Gilgamesh, hunter-king of Uruk, 181
  deputy of sun-god, 135
  epic, Elysium or Olympus? 134; magic plant, 78; scant respect for minor gods, 133
Girgashites, 195
Glaser, Ed., 156, 176 *f.*, 198, 351
Gnostics, on creation, 16 (*n.* 1)
God—divine duad, 16, 33, 35, 52, 59, 279; divine triad, 15 *f.*, 279, 292; Phœnician triad of deities, 53; displacement of early duad or triad, 65; divine jealousy, 81, 118, 125; primitive god, 31; humanity of God, 15, 17; the nomadic and the agricultural stage, 30; Father God, 23; Mother-goddess, 16 *f.*, 22; 'God-man,' 49 (with *n.* 1)
God, in Gâthic hymns and in Israel's higher religion, compared, 1
Gods, animal, 31, 79, 117. *See also* Eagle, Lion, Sun-god, Tree-god, Moon-god, Animal-men
Gog and Magog, 157 *f.*
Goldziher, Ign., 69 (*n.* 4)
Gomer, 157 *ff.*
Goshen, land of, 478-480, 485
Gray, G. B., ix, 93 (*n.* 1), 277, 313, 423 (*n.* 2), 425 (*n.* 3), 427, 571 (*n.* 1)
Greek Deluge-story, Deucalion, 129 (Pindar), 138 (Iris)
Grenfell, A., 5 (*n.* 2)
Gressmann, Hugo, 15 (*n.* 1), 19, 30 (*n.* 4), 48 (*n.* 2), 57 (*n.* 2), 58 (*n.* 1), 72 (*n.* 3), 94 (*n.* 3), 525 (*n.* 2)
Grüneisen, 372 (on Rachel)
Gunkel, H., 8 (*n.* 2), 30 (*n.* 4), 60, 71, 99 *f.*, 104, 137 (*n.* 1), 178 (*n.* 2), 183, 271 *f.*, 294, 314, 318 *ff.*, 327 *ff.*, 332, 361, 364 *f.*, 367, 377, 379, 391, 395, 401 (*n.* 1), 406, 415, 420, 425, 435, 464, 495, 500, 502, etc.

Hadad (II.), 432
Hadrach, explained, 92, 467
Hagar, name, 268 *f.*
  overlooked mentions of name, 266, 268
  fortunes of, 23, 266 *ff.*
Ḥam, 32 (*n.* 2), 150, 152. *See* Shem, Ham, Yepheth
Ḥammanim, symbols of god Raḥman, 25; cp. Baal-ḥammân
Ḫammurabi, 6, 65, 197, 267, 274 (*n.* 3), 314 (Sarah), 318 (Hagar), 352, 403
Ḥamor, 408
Ḥanôk, Reubenite, Midianite, and S. Arabian name, 105. *See* Enoch
  altered into Noaḥ or Naḥam, 114
  explained, 105, 113
  parallel Phrygian name, 128
Haoma-plant, juice of, 78, 80
Haran, 210-213
Ḥaran, 210-213, 343
Harper, W. R., 33 (*n.* 3), 38, 402, 430 (*n.* 2)
Harris, J. Rendel, 293
Harrison, Jane, 53 (*n.* 2)
Hashmannim (Ps. lxviii.), explained, 490
Haupt, Paul, 51, 77, 87, 166, 556
Havilah, 92 *f.*, 175, 198, 271
Hazar-maveth, 198 *f.*
Hebrew children, persecution of, 518
Hebron, origin of name, 335
Hermon, Mount, 119
Herodotus (ii. 109), 489
Hesperides, garden of, 80
Heth. *See* Hittites
Hiddekel, river, 87, 88 *f.*, 91, 263
Hinnom, valley of, 51
Hiram, Arabian origin of, 46
Hittites (Hethites), 194, 336
Hoffmann, G., 25, 42 (*n.* 2), 46 (*n.* 2), 67, 130 (*n.* 1)
Hogg, H. W., 377, 380 (*n.* 1), 420, 434 (*n.* 1), 472 *f.*, 500 (*n.* 1)
Holzinger, H., 28 *f.*, 87 (*n.* 1), 333, 502, 521 (*n.* 1), 565

Hommel, Fritz, 21, 22 (*n.*[2]), 23 (*n.*[3]), 24, 25 (*nn.*[2,3]), 27, 28 (*n.*[3]), 50 (*n.*[2]), 53 (*n.*[1]), 56, 64, 86, 89 (*n.*[1]), 91 *f.*, 103, 106, 111 *f.*, 115, 119, 134, 171 (*n.*[1]), 177 (*n.*[1]), 376, 247, 304, 310, 355, 358 *f.*, 178, 403, 461 (*n.*[1]), 473 (*n.*[1]), 521 (*n.*[1])
Honey of Paradise, 41; cp. 77
of Canaan, 475
Hophra, 224 (with *n.*[1])
Horeb, Mount, 31, 527, 537 (*n.*[1]). *See* Sinai
Horite, explained, 241, 424 (with *n.*[2])
Horses in Arabia? 462
Hur, as a proper name, 23
Hyrieus, myth of, 292

Indian mythology — first woman, 75; Indra, soma-juice, 78; Deluge, 131 *f.*; development of story, 142 *f.*; exposure of young solar hero, 519 *f.*
Inscriptions—Egyptian, 273, 287, 404; Assyrian, 404, etc.; Amarna Tablets, 13 (*n.*[3]), 28 (*n.*[3]), 46, 48, 50 (*n.*[3]), 66, 115 (*n.*[3]), 122, 124 (*n.*[3]), 249, 313 (*n.*[3]), 335 (*n.*[5]), 345, 355, 392, 405, 426, 480, 483 (*bis*); Gezer tablet (II.), 431 (*n.*[4]); Tell Ta'annek tablet, 29 (*n.*[1]), 54 (*n.*[1]); Aramaic, 51; Aramaic papyri (Assuan), 23 (*n.*[2]), 26, 28, 65, 109, 146 (*n.*[2]), 162, 333, 409 (*n.*[2]); Moabite stone, 25, 46, 50, 423; Phœnician, 18 (*n.*[2]), 21, 23, 26, 27, 30, 42 (*n.*[2]), 43 *ff.* (names of Arabian origin), 57, 65, 199, 309, 488 (*n.*[2]), etc.; Palmyrene, 28, 59, 109 (*n.*[2]), 141 *f.*, 273 *f.*, 277, 278 (*n.*[1]), 313 (*n.*[3]), 322 (*n.*[3]), 381 (*n.*[1]); Zenjirli, 16, 23, 28, 57, 68, 102 (*n.*[2]); Minæan, 380 (*n.*[1]); Syro-Greek, 409
Iolaus, Punic god. *See* Eshmun, Phœnician
Isaac, meaning of name, 289 (cp. 344)
birth of, 317
earlier forms of story of, 324
why no change of name, 289
at Gerar and Beer-sheba, 363
connected with Tamûz or Adonis, 325
Isaac of Antioch, quoted, 325 (*n.*[2])
Ishmael, theories of the name, 29 *f.*, 272 *f.*
sent into the wilderness, 317 *ff.*
his Miṣrite wife, 320
in later legend, 268 (*n.*[2])
tribes of, 353
pillars devoted to the god, 369
tree of, 322, 383
synonymous with Yeraḥme'el, 272
often mentioned in the original texts, 272
Ishtar, underlying story of midwives, 517
'Ishtar, descent of,' 53 (*n.*[1]), 82 (*n.*[1]).
Ishtaru, ishtaritu, 'goddess,' 68
Israel, explained, 403 *f.*
Issachar, tribal name, 379 *f.*
Ithamar, explained, 448 (*n.*[2])
Ithobalos, explained, 46

Jachin. *See* Yakin
Jacob, explained, 359, 403; cp. 399
his name changed, 404 *f.*
the Hebrew Odysseus, 364, 399
his journey to Laban's home, 367
his stone not a *baityl*, 370
his compacts with Laban, 383 *ff.*, 385, 388
his wrestling match — with whom? 399 *ff.*
his meeting with Esau, 405 *ff.*
his purchase of land, 407 *ff.*
his residence near Shechem, 440
his residence at Hebron, 440
sacrifices at Beer-sheba, 480
his blessings (chap. xlix.), 495 *ff.*
his funeral, 512 *ff.*
his religion the same as Laban's, 387, 390
his enormous strength, 398
Japanese parallel to Moses-myth, 518 *f.*
Jasher. *See* Yashar.
Jastrow, M., 4 (*n.*[1]), 11, 18, (*n.*[2]), 22 (*n.*[1]), 73 (*n.*[3]), 76, 83 (*n.*[4]), 94 (*n.*[2]), 131, 155, 170, 173, 279 (*n.*[1]), 299, 309, 564
Jebusite. *See* Yebusite.
Jensen, Paul, 25 (*n.*[2]), 66, 78 (*nn.*[4,5]), 133 (*nn.*[1,3]), 134 (*n.*[1]), 140 (*n.*[2]), 182 (*n.*[1]), 186, 210, 295
Jeremias, A., 11, 78 (*n.*[4]), 140 (*n.*[3]), 166, 182 (*n.*[1]), 248 (*n.*[1]), 359 (*n.*[3]), 368 (*n.*[1]), 453, 479, 497
Jerusalem, the new, 83
Jeshurun. *See* Yeshurun
Jethro. *See* Yithro
Jezebel, explained, 46
Job, myth of, 13 (*n.*[3])
name explained, 13 (*n.*[3]), 116
book of, Arabian affinities, 40
stone of, religious significance, 20 (*n.*[1])
a first man, 13 (*n.*[3])
Johns, C. H. W., 23 (*n.*[2]), 48, 66, 173, 261 (*n.*[1]), 315, 357 (*n.*[3]), 403, 432 (*n.*[2]), etc.
Jordan, 228, 456
Joseph, name explained, 381 *f.*
blessing of, 506 *ff.*
theories of, 434; Adonis elements, 56, 439
his 'coat of many colours (?), 436
his second dream, 437

Joseph—*continued*
bought by a Miṣrite, 440
bought by Potiphar, 440; cp. Potiphar, Potiphera
interprets dreams, 453, 454 *ff.*
fulfilment of his early dreams, 474
grand-vizier, 461 *ff.*
his Miṣrite name, 468-470
his relation to king, 459
Joseph-tribe, origin of, 470
Josiphiah, 381
Judah, name explained, 376; blessing of, 502 *ff.*
experiences with Tamar, 445 *ff.*
and Tamar, mythic elements in, 445

Kadesh, a district name, 45 (*n.* 1), 561
Israelite centre, 561
name carried to Phœnicia, 45
southern, its situation, 312 *f.*
Kain and Kenan, origin of, 102 *f.*, 113
Bab. parallel to name, 113
sign, 104 *f.*
tribe, seat of the, 105
Kalevala (Finnish epic), 9, 14, 22, 41 (*n.* 3), 70, 420
Kaphtorim, 191 *f.*
Kasdim, a supposed Bedouin tribe of, 332
Kasluḥim, 191
Kemosh (Moabite god), 423; cp. 277
Kenites, their influence on Israel, 17
Kesiṭah, explained, 409
Keṭurah, 351 *f.*
Kids, law as to seething, 565 *f.*
Kinship, primitive, 31, 98
Kiryath-arba, 42 ('city of four'!), 334 *f.*
Kiryath-yearim, 503
Kittel, R., 29, 213 (*n.* 3)
Kittim, 166 *f.*
König, Ed., 15 (*n.* 3), 177, 310, 329
Koran. Angelic keeper of hell, 53
Kraetschmar, 246 (*n.* 1)
Kuenen, Abr., 412 *f.*
Kush, 90, 170 *f.*, 181

Laban, 123, 345
Labanites, 32, 123, 184
Lagarde, Paul de, 2, 42, 106 (*n.* 3), 406 (*n.* 2).
Lagrange, Père, 12 *f.*, 25, 43, 51, 370 *f.*
Lambert, M., 70
Lamech, explained, 106 *f.*
his song, 109
Languages, myth on variety of, 203
Lapana, Lapân, 123, 345, 355, 406
Leah, explained, 373
a serpent demon? 97 (*n.* 4), 373
Lebanon, the Punic, 31 (*n.* 1)
the Arabian, 123, 457
Lenormant, Fr., 106
Levi, tribal name, 375; cp. 523 (*n.* 1)
Life, synonymous with knowledge, 75
Lion, divine, 35, 54
Lithuanian deluge-story, 127, 138
Logos, the, 50 (with *n.* 2), 60 (with *n.* 4)
Lot, 211, 301, 425
the primary, 308
his wife, 303, 305 *f.*
his drunkenness, 306
Lot-story, development of, 300 *f.*
Lotan, 211
Love-apples, 379
Love-charm, food shared as a, 80
Luther, B., 98 (*n.* 2), 390 (*n.* 5), 405, 409, 445 (*n.* 1), 506

Maakath, 167, 319, 333
Mabbul, origin of, 144 *f.*
Macalister, 424 (*n.* 3)
Madai, 159 *ff.*
Mahabhârata, Indian epic, 129 *f.*, 520
Mahanaim, legend of, 391 *f.*
Makir, 514
Malak the Guardian, 567
Mal'ak Yahweh, 40, 58-60, 101, 277-280, 291-294, 318, 329, 525, 528
Malkah, divine name, 18, 51
Man, in Jewish eschatology, 102 (*n.* 1). *See* Son of Man
life of, how and why shortened, 118
Man, the first, a king and a demigod, 14, 71
has he no proper name? 71, 98, 100, cp. 96, 116 *f.*
his wisdom, 115
his fate, 83
Manasseh. *See* Menasseh
Mandæans, 25 (*n.* 1), 77, 110 (*n.* 2).
Manu, first man, and hero of Indian deluge-story, 129 *f.*
Marah, mythic affinities, 559 *f.*
Margoliouth, D. S., 33
Marquart, xii, 425 (*n.* 1), 429 *ff.*, 468, 501
Marriages of divine beings, 116 *f.*
Marti, Karl, 36 (*n.* 1), 61 (*n.* 1), 103
Maspero, G., 15 (*n.* 1), 74 (*n.* 1), 130 (*n.* 2), 134, 322 (*n.* 4)
Massah and Meribah, 559 *f.*
Matred, explained, 433
Mazzaloth, meaning of, 19 (*n.* 2)
Mehetabel, 432
Meilichios, origin of, 53 (*n.* 2)
Meinhold, J., 69
Melchizedek, 251 *ff.*
Melek (Malk), divine name, 50-52, 324 *f.*, 327
Meluḥḥa = N.W. Arabia? 161
Men, first, endowments of, 13-15
Menasseh, 471 *f.*, 514
Merari, 482
Meshezabel, 433
Messiah, the, son of Död, 47 *f.*, 57
son of God, 56 *f.*
death of, 56

Methuselah, 106
Meyer, Ed., ii-vi, viii, x, 27 (*n.* 2), 34 (*n.* 1), 42 (*n.* 2), 65 (*n.* 3), 67, 97 (*n.* 4), 154, 172, 179 (*n.* 2), 183 (*n.* 1), 269, 285 (*n.* 3), 288, 289 (*n.* 3), 313, 352, 373, 382, 391 (*n.* 1), 408, 414, (*n.* 1), 415 *f.*, 422, 488 (*n.* 2), 509, 513, 521 (*n.* 3), 525, 542, 546 (*n.* 1), 563
Michabazo in N. Amer. myth, 125
Michael (Mikael), a heavenly Being, 4, 11, 37, 38 (*n.* 1), 48, 59, 60 (with notes), 119, 279, 293 (with *n.* 3), 346
compared with Marduk and Mithra, 60, 102 (with *n.* 3)
Midian, 353, 441 (Winckler), 522
Milk and honey of Paradise, 41, 84, 455; of Canaan, 455, 529, 530 (*n.* 1)
Milkah, 215
Milkom (Malkam), 51
Miriam, explained, 558
Miṣraim (Egypt), extension of meaning? xi.
Miṣrim (in N. Arabia), xi.-xiii. 6 (*n.* 4), 32 (*n.* 2), 171-173, 224, 262, 320, 354 (*n.* 1)
in the Joseph-story, 441, 443, 453 *f.*
in the Exodus-story, 517, 543 *ff.*
god of, 32
its fine linen, 436; cp. 464
its divining bowls, 476 *f.*
Miṣṣor, regional and place-name, 172, 305. *See* Miṣrim.
Mithraism, 368 (*n.* 1)
Moab and Ammon, 306-310
Moon-god, 25 (*n.* 2), 27
Moore, G. F., 24
Moriah, 327
Moses (Môsheh) explained, iii. 521
originally a Levite? 524
hidden among the rushes, 518
parallels to story of child, 518-521
his wife, 171, 523, 533
early legends of, 522 *ff.*
his staff, 532
his song, 557 *f.*
how he received the laws, 567 *f.*
Enoch (Hanôk) compared, 520
clan of, xi., 65
Mountain of God, 71, 527, 569
Mountains, sanctity of, 30 *f.*
seven supernatural, 83
Müller, D. H., 106, 380 (*n.* 1)
F. Max, 10 (*n.* 3), 75
W. Max, ix. (*n.* 1), 58, 164, 190, 225, 399 (*n.* 5), 425 (*n.* 1), 516
Muṣri, 262. *See* Miṣrim.

Naaman, divine name, 36, 56 (with *n.* 2), 483
Naham (=Noah), 114, 151
Nahor, 210, 331, 343 *f.*, 390
Nahorites, Gunkel's theory of, 332
Nahshon, explained, 540
'Name,' meaning of, 21, 45
of a god, ineffable, 401 (*n.* 1)
Naphtah, tribal name, 376 *ff.*
Naphtuhim, 190 *f.*
Natânu (=Nathan), origin of, 64 (*n.* 2)
'Navel of the earth,' 94 *f.*
Naville, Ed., 516
Nebuchadrezzar, the name, 426
wisdom of, 40
a temple builder, 44, 81
Negeb, the, 453
Nehushtan, explained, 42
Nephilim (or Niphlites?), 121-123, 355
Nergalli, colossal lions, 102
Nestle, Eb., 336, 540 *f.*
Nethinim, explained, 431, 467
New Zealand myths. *See* Polynesian
Nielsen, D., 280, 523-525
Nile, the, 455 *f.*
Nimrod, problem of, 180-185
Nineveh in Gen. x., 188
Niobe, myth of, 301
Noah, hero of, deluge-story, 113, etc. *See* Naham
vine-dresser, 142
Nöldeke, Theod., 24, 71 (*n.* 1), 98, 321, 381, 427, 540
Noordtzij, 173, 193, 312 (with *n.* 2), 355 (*n.* 1)
Numerals read in error, 264

Oholibamah, origin of, 423
Oil of the gods (or of Paradise), 41, 78, 84; cp. 371
in Christian ritual, 78 (*n.* 3)
On, Oni, Ono, 420, 471
Onyx-stone (?), 93
Orpheus and Eurydice, 276

Paddan-Aram, 357 *f.*
Palm-tree, 77
Palmer, Prof. E. H., 298, 453
Paradise, the Hebrew, originally in Arabia, 85 *ff.*, 90, 455
in the upper world, 84, 455
Mesopotamia? 86 *ff.*
its river, 78, 85, 455
streams, 41, 84 *f.*
the mountain of, 83; crowned by a city, 131
Parnassus, Mount, 94
Par'osh (flea-clan?), viii. *f.*; 408, 432, 541 (*n.* 3)
Pashḥur, origin of, ix. (*n.* 1), 541
Passover, 399; rules of, 548 *f.*
Pathros, Pathrusim, 155 *f.*, 159 (*n.* 2), 189 *f.*, 436
Peiser, 86, 93 (*n.* 1)
Peleg, 197

Peleth, 312 (*n.* 2)
Pelew islanders, leaf-fibre loin-garment, 80 (*n.* 1)
Penuel, origin of, 122
Perath, river, 91 *f.*, 162 *f.*
Perez and Zerah, 357, 449
Persian Gulf, 86, 90, 133 *f.*
Peruvian deluge-myth, 297
Peters, J. P., 113 (*n.* 1), 301 (*n.* 1), 345 (*n.* 1), 360
Pethor. *See* Balaam
Petrie, Flinders, 16, 367, 487, 531, 554
Pharaoh (?), 223, 458
Philemon and Baucis, 392
Philistines in O.T., who are they? 192, 312
Phinehas, 173, 460 *f.*, 469 *f.*
Phœnician mythology, Cosmic egg, 4, 22; Βααυ = Bab. Ba'u, 22; Eshmun, 31 (*n.* 1), 42 *f.*, 45, 52, 54, 373; Melḳarth, 30 (*n.* 2), 46 (origin), 54; Resheph, 57 *f.*; Samemrumos, 18 (*n.* 1), 359; Tanith, 43, 45, 573; Kabiri, 42, 293 (*n.* 1); Kronos (El), 52, 68 (*n.* 1). *See* Adonis
Phœnicians, Arabian origin of, 43
fetishes of, 34
Phrygian deluge-myth, 128 *f.*
Pi-hahiroth, 554
Pikol, explained, 320, 363
Pillar of fire and cloud, 557
Pinches, Theoph., 77
Pishon, river, 92
Pithom, 516
Plagues, the, 542 *ff.*
origin of story, 542
Plutarch, quoted, 357
Polybius, referred to, 34, 42 (*n.* 3)
Polynesian and New Zealand myths; bird-creator, 9; cosmic egg, 9; New Zealand cosmogonies, 140; cosmogonic darkness, 10; deluge, 127; heaven and earth, separation of, 128; parallels to Eve-story, 74 *f.*; Mani, divine man, 71 (*n.* 2); Paradises, 84; rainbow, 'path of the gods,' 138; twins, rivalry of, 356, 449
Polyphemus, story of, 365
Potiphar. *See* Joseph
his wife, 450 *f.*
his second name, 452
Potiphera, explained, 442
Priest-rulers, 523
Priests, Israelitish, 62 *f.*
Prophecy, origin of, 20 (*n.* 3), 61 *f.*
Proverbs, canonical, in Arabian style, 40 (with *n.* 3)
Putiel, 461, 540 *f.*

Raamses, 487 *f.*
Rab-mag, explained, 159
Rachel, 372 *f.*, 418 *ff.*
Radau, creation-story, 282
Rahab, explained, 6 *f.*
Rainbow, origin of, in P, 136
not in J nor in Babylonian epic, 136
parallel to Greek Iris, 136. *See* Bow, Lithuanian, Polynesian
Ranke, H., 30, 514
Raphael, 293
Ratzel (on N. American myth), 126
Rebecca (Ribḳah), 333, 344 *f.*
Reḥoboth, 186, 335, 431
Reḳem, place-name, 179, 200, 312, etc.
Renan, Ernest, 280
Rephidim, 561 *f.*
Resheph, place-name or clan-name, 58; cp. Arabian, Phœnician
Reuben, 374 *f.*, 420 *f.*, 500
Rogers, B. W., 213, 519 (*n.* 3)

Sabbath in the cosmogony, 69
Sabbath, Babylonian, 69
Sacrifices, few in early times, 31, 61
in later times, 36, 61, 63
human, 52, 324, 326 (children)
of lambs in spring, 56
of stags, 324
Salekath, 315-317, 406 *f.*, 409
Sammael, name of arch-demon, 54
Samsi, queen of Aribu, 488 (*n.* 2)
Samsi-iluna, underlying form, 274 (*n.* 2)
Samson, birth announced, 291
Sanballat, explained, 213 (*n.* 1)
Saphon, origin and use of, 30, 32, 50 (*n.* 3), 80 (*n.* 5), 85, 158
Sarah's death, 334
Sarai and Sarah, 215, 288, 307, 310 *ff.*
Ṣarephath, the southern, 62 (*n.* 2), 312; cp. 200 (more than one)
Ṣarephathites, 192
Ṣargina, story of child, 519; cp. Moses
Sayce, A. H., 28, 59 (*n.* 4), 64, 85 (*n.* 1), 86, 96, 133 (*n.* 1), 158, 165 (*n.* 1), 334 (*n.* 1), 361 (*n.* 2), 521 (*n.* 1)
Scandinavian myth. Rainbow, 'bridge of the gods,' 136
Schmidt, N., 38 (*n.* 2), 57 (*n.* 1), 60 (*n.* 3), 158 (*n.* 2), 412 (*n.* 3)
Schultens, 100
Schwally, Friedr., 13, 70 (*n.* 2), 387 (*n.* 5)
Scythian invasion, 164
Seir, 211, 241, 358 *f.*, 405
Seraiah, 288, 404
Serpent, in Gen. iii., 78 *f.*, 80 (a demon-lover), 82. *See* Apepi, Aztec, Leah
Sha'atnez, 565
Shaddai, 24, 65, 282 *f.*, 475
Shalem, divine name, 46; place-name, 407
Shamgar, explained, 524
Sheba, 176 (with *n.* 3), 198, 352
Shechem, 220, 407, 413, 494 *f.*

Shekel problem, 570
Shekels, standard, 311
Shem, Ham, and Yepheth, origin of, 117; cp. 150, 155, 164
Sheol, origin of, 54
Sheshak, explained, 187
Sheth, explained, 109
Shihor, explained, 121, 263
Shiloh, 502 *f.*
Shimeon, tribal name, 375; with Levi, 501
  left in Misrim bound, 474
Shinar, explained, 185 *f.*, 360
Shishak, 47
Shittim wood, 147
Shur, from Asshur, 23, 121, 269, 559
Shurippak, on the Euphrates (Gilgamesh epic), 132 (with *n.* 1)
Ṣibeon = Ishmael, 20 (*n.* 1), 85, 425
Ṣidon, origin of name, 193 *f.*
  the southern, 17, 314, 504
Sievers, Ed., 99 (*n.* 2), 121, 144, 147, 252, 294 (*n.* 1), 341 (*n.* 1), 502
Sinai, 28, 32, 527 *f.*, 562 (volcano)
Sippar (in deluge-story), 130
Ṣipporah. *See* Moses
Smith, G. A., 396 *f.*
Smith, H. P., 534 *f.* (on Ex. iv. 18-26)
Smith, W. R., viii, 4 (*n.* 2), 9, 31 (*n.* 1), 34 (*n.* 1), 42 (*n.* 4), 79 (*n.* 1), 98, 118 (*n.* 1), 289 (*n.* 1), 301 (*n.* 1), 324 (*n.* 2), 361 (*n.* 2), 365, 421 (*n.* 2), 423 *ff.*, 425, 493 *f.*, 500, 565 *f.*
Ṣoan, origin of, xiii
Ṣoar, place-name, 296, 303, 307
Ṣocotra, island, is it the home of Ut-napishtim? 136
Sodom and Gomorrah, 297 *f.*
Sodom-story and Deluge-story compared, 299 *f.*
  scientific view of, 297
Sojourn, length of the Miṣrite, 547
Soma-plant, juice of, 77, 79
Son of God and Son of Man, 57
Son of Man parallel to Messiah and to Logos, 60
Ṣor. *See* Miṣṣor
Spiegelberg, E., 320, 375, 516
Spirit, divine, as a cosmic power, 20
  Mandæan view of the, 25 (*n.* 1)
  conceived of as an airlike substance, 118
Stade, B., 71, 96 (*n.* 3), 102, 109, 118, 160, 204 (*n.* 1), 322 (*n.* 5), 402 (*n.* 1), 489 (*n.* 3), 565 (*n.* 4)
Steer-god, 35, 509
Steuernagel, C., 218, 344 (*n.* 1), 394, 404 *f.*, 424, 445 (*n.* 1), 565
Stones, divine breath in, 128; cp. 509
Stucken, Ed., 125, 126 (*n.* 2, 3), 128 (*n.* 2), 129 (*n.* 2), 139 (*n.* 2), 276, 285 (*n.* 2), 293, 301 (*n.* 1), 307, 366, 373 (*n.* 3), 379, 415, 497
Succoth, 397, 406 *f.*, 516 (Naville's), 553 *f.*
Sumer (S. Babylonia), 185
Sun-disk, winged, 8
Suph, sea of, 551 *ff.*; passage of, 555 *f.*
Sword, divine, 100 *f.*
Syrian deluge-story (Lucian), 127 *f.*

Table of nations, 154 *ff.*
  Budde's and Wellhausen's theory, 155
Taboos, 81, 139
Tahpanhes, 554
Talmai, 336 (*n.* 1)
Talmud, 11
Tamar, origin of, 77 (*n.* 2), 307 (*n.* 2), 447 *f.*
Tamarisk, sacred tree in Egypt, 322
Tamûz, 19 (*n.* 3), 47, 434, 438, 453. *See* Dôd, Joseph
Tanith. *See* Phœnician
Tarshish, where situated, 134 (Jensen), 165 *f.*
  origin of name, 166, 571
Teman, origin of, 40 (*n.* 2), 424
Temples, primitive, 31
Temptation, the, 72
Tent of meeting? 568 *f.*
Terah, 210
Thompson, R. C., 79 (*n.* 1)
Tiâmat, 4 (with *n.* 2), 11, 140, 511, 552
Tiele, C. P., 146, 326 (*n.* 1)
Timnah, place-name, 448
Tola, 482
Torrey, C. R., 45 (*n.* 1)
Totemism, viii-ix, 333, 375, 423 *ff.*
Toy, C. H., 39 (*n.* 4), 95 (*n.* 2), 503
Tree-gods, 12, 24, 31
Tree-men, 75
Tree-spirits, 79
Tree of knowledge, 75
Tree of life, 75, 77, 94 (with *n.* 1)
Trees (or plants), magic, 41, 71, 78, 133
Triads, Egyptian and Babylonian, 16 (*n.* 1)
Tribes, twelve, 331 (Nahor), 353 (Ishmael)
Trumbull, 80 *f.*
Tubal and Meshek, 161 *f.*
Tubal-Ḳain, 103, 107 *f.*
Tyre (Ṣor), origin of Hebrew name, 46, 72 (*n.* 4)

Ulmer, 421 (*n.* 2), 424, 521
Ur-Kasdim, 213 *f.*
Usener, 84, 129 (*n.* 3), 131
Ut-napishtim, Babylonian hero of the Deluge, 116, 134 *ff.*
  meaning of name, 133
  not a king but a rich citizen, 134

Ut-napishtim—*continued*
properly solar-mythical, 142
his apotheosis, 133
translated whither? 135-137
Uz, 180, 331

Vine, 77
Virgin, celestial, 21
Volz, Paul, 48 (*n.* 2)

Waitz-Gerland, 9 *f.*, 75 (*n.* 4), 85 (*n.* 1), 128 (*n.* 2), 142 (*n.* 2)
Water of healing, 133
death, 134 (*n.* 2)
Weeks of ten days (?), 347
Wellhausen, Jul., 24 (*n.* 4), 110, 120 (*n.* 2), 144 (*n.* 3), 276, 351, 362, 379 (*n.* 2), 389, 408 *f.*, 411, 426, 502, 511, 533
Whatham, A. E., 81 (on Gen. iii.)
Wife's right of property, 314 *f.*
Winckler, Hugo, iv, xi, 11, 15, 28, 33 (*n.* 2), 46 (*n.* 1, 2), 47, 49 (*n.* 1), 56, 66, 75 (*n.* 6), 89 (*n.* 3), 94 (*n.* 3), 101, 103 (*n.* 1), 104 (*n.* 1), 118, 120, 140 (*n.* 2), 142 (*n.* 1), 158 (*n.* 2), 164, 166, 211, 262 (*n.* 1), 321 *f.*, 354 (*n.* 1), 359, 371, 393, 410, 415, 420, 435 *ff.*, 453, 479, 497, 513, 559
Wine of Paradise, 41, 84
Wisdom, mythic representation, 38-40
derived by Israelites from Arabia, 40 *f.*
Ea, Babylonian god of, 13 (*n.* 3)
Ishtar, Babylonian goddess of, 38 (*n.* 2)
Woman, the first, her name, 96 *ff.*

Xisuthros, 111, 113, 115, 132 (origin of name; Berossian story)
tenth of the early Babylonian kings, 131

Yabal, Yubal, 107, 109
Yabboḳ, 396 *f.*
Yahu, regional name, 66
Yahweh, Yāhu, origin of, 64-66, 100 (*n.* 1); cp. 530 *f.*
Yahweh, worship of, in N. Arabia, 314, 339
Yahweh, a lion-god and a steer-god, 35
Elohim, explained, 99-101, 153
Ṣeba'oth, origin of, 19 *f.*, 35 (*n.* 1), 59
Yakin and Boaz, 30 (with *n.* 3), 369
Yakob, Yakobites. *See* Jacob
Yama, first man, in the Veda, 71 (*n.* 2), 83
Yaman (or Yawan), 6 (*n.* 3), 160 *f.*, 210
Yamani, adventure at Ashdod, 161
Yanḥamu, Egyptian official, 48 (*n.* 1), 115 (*n.* 3), 479
Yarḥam, Yeraḥme'el, 16, 27 *f.* (origin of name)
no mere storm-god, 66
a lion- and a steer-god, 35
equivalent to Baal, 32, 61 *ff.*
earlier and later, 30 *ff.*, 36 *ff.*; cp. 32 (*n.* 2)
Creator, 37 *f.*
sender of the Deluge, 140 *f.*
a Semitic Pluto, 30, 53 *f.*, 206
absolutely wise, 38 *ff.*
a healer, 37, 41 *f.*
his title Ṣedeḳ, 194
his title 'Face of Yahweh,' 279
Yarḥon, stream, 228, 456, etc.
Yarimuta, in Amarna letters, 480 (*n.* 1)
Yarmuth, place-name, 479
Yashar, Book of, 404 (with *n.* 4)
Yebusites, in ch. x., 195, 336, 425
Yegar-sahadutha, 389
Yehudah, tribal name, 370
Yeraḥme'el, name of a great race, vii, viii, 18
supposed earliest people, 96
silver of, 316
pillars, 369
tree, 383
Yeraḥme'el-Yahweh, 369, 391
Yeraḥme'elites, racial centre of, 32
great archers, 366
weak religion of, 37
reputed wisdom of, 40, 460
priests and diviners of, 62, 376
practices of the, forbidden, 565 *f.*
Yeroḥam, origin of, 29
Yeshurun, 23 *f.*, 404
Yetûr (Iturœa), 354
Yima, 'fair shepherd,' 71
king of Paradise, 14, 83, 129
Yithro (Jethro), 40 (*n.* 3)
Yobab, 200, 430
Yokebed, 539

Zaphon. *See* Ṣaphon
Zarephath. *See* Ṣarephath
Zebulun, tribal name, 148, 380
Zerah, 311
Zibeon. *See* Ṣibeon
Zilpah, 373
Zimmern, H., 22 (*n.* 1), 48 (*n.* 1), 59 (*n.* 2), 71 (*n.* 4), 111 (*n.* 5), 113 (*notes*), 125, 140, 142 (*n.* 2), 280 (*n.* 1), 496 *f.*, 569 (*n.* 1)
Zoan. *See* Ṣoan
Zoar. *See* Ṣoar
Zodiac, 5, 11, 437, 474 (*n.* 1), 497
Zoroaster, birth-story of, 289
Zoroastrianism, Gen. i., supposed Zoroastrian affinities, 2; similarly, Ex.

iii. 14, 530 (*n.* 2); Angra Mainyu (Ahriman), 2; Amshaspands, 11, cp. 38 (*n.* 1); Ahura Mazda (Ormazd), 1, 11, 38 (*n.* 1), or Aûharmazd, 10; Armarti, 38 (*n.* 1); Iranian Deluge-myth, not original, 129; Dualism, 1; Gaokerena, 84; Gayomard, 75; Gothic hymns, 1; Heaven-tree, 75 (*n.* 2); Healing plants (heavenly), 77; Herb diet, primitive, 3; Light, creation of, 11; Lights uncreated, 10; Mountain, heavenly, 83 *f.*; Paradise, earthly, 84; Renovation of the world, 36; Thrita, a divine healer, 41 f.; Vohûman, *see* Amshaspands; Tree of Life, *see* Gaokerena; Wisdom, heavenly, 38 (*n.* 2); Bahman Yast, i. 3, p. 282 (*n.* 1); Ard Yast, x. 56, p. 365 (*n.* 3). *See* Tree-men, Yima

INDEX OF BIBLICAL AND COGNATE LITERARY PASSAGES

GENESIS

i. 2 *a*, p. 22
i. 2 *b*, pp. 8, 15, 20-22
i. 3-5, 6-8, p. 11
i. 11, p. 12
i. 14-18, p. 11
i. 20-24, p. 12
i. 21, 25, p. 12
i. 26, p. 14
i. 26-28, pp. 7, 11 *f.*, 14, 71
i. 29, pp. 3, 7
i. 31, p. 125
ii.-iii. p. 14
ii. 2 *f.*, p. 69 *f.*
ii. 4 *b*-iii. 24, p. 70
ii. 6, p. 86 *f.*
ii. 8, 15, p. 72
ii. 9, pp. 75, 94
ii. 11-14, p. 85
ii. 17, iii. 3, pp. 76, 94
ii. 18, p. 7
ii. 18-21, p. 73
ii. 21 *f.*, 25, p. 74
ii. 23, p. 96
iii. 1-7, p. 79
iii. 3, 6, 11, p. 75
iii. 6 *a*, p. 21
iii. 7-21, p. 79
iii. 7, 22 *a*, p. 95
iii. 8, p. 100
iii. 16, p. 79
iii. 17, p. 125
iii. 20, p. 97
iii. 22, pp. 15, 81
iii. 22 *b*, 23 *a*, p. 95
iv. 1, p. 76
iv. 1-16, pp. 100 *ff.*
iv. 17-24 (26), pp. 105 *ff.*
v. 1-5, pp. 115 *ff.*
v. 3, p. 14
v. 5, p. 116
v. 22, p. 113
v. 29, pp. 116 *ff.*
vi. 1-6, p. 15
vi. 1, 2, pp. 116 *ff.*, 123
vi. 3, pp. 21, 81, 118
vi. 4, pp. 120 *f.*
vi. 6, pp. 141 *f.*
vi. 9, p. 113
vi. 14, pp. 146 *f.*
vi. 16 *a*, p. 148
vi. 17, pp. 142 *f.*
vii. 4, 12, 23, p. 143
vii. 7, 10, ix. 11, p. 143
vii. 22, p. 146
viii. 4, p. 135
viii. 6, pp. 143, 149
viii. 21, pp. 141 *f.*
ix. 6, p. 14
ix. 12-16, p. 136
x., pp. 154 *ff.*
x. 1, 32, p. 143
x. 5, pp. 167 *ff.*
x. 6, p. 32 (*n.*[2])
x. 16-18 *a*, p. 195
x. 17, p. 23
xi. 1-9, pp. 81, 201 *f.*
xi. 4, p. 18 (*n.*[1])
xi. 7, p. 15
xi. 10, p. 143
xi. 10-26, pp. 209 *ff.*
xi. 27-32, pp. 211 *ff.*
xii. 1-9, pp. 217 *ff.*
xii. 10-20, pp. 222 *ff.*
xiii. 2, 5-18, pp. 226 *ff.*
xiv., pp. 230 *ff.*
xiv. 13, p. 436
xiv. 18 *ff.*, pp. 253 *f.*
xiv. 19, 22, p. 37
xv., pp. 257 *ff.*
xv. 2, pp. 44, 56
xvi., pp. 266 *ff.*
xvi. 11, p. 279
xvi. 12, p. 274
xvi. 13 *f.*, pp. 23, 275 *ff.*
xvi. 14, p. 311
xvii., p. 281 *ff.*
xviii., p. 15 *f.*
xviii. 1-15, p. 290 *ff.*
xviii. 16-33, p. 295
xix. 1-28, pp. 296 *ff.*
xix. 24, p. 64
xix. 26, p. 73
xix. 30-38, pp. 306 *ff.*
xx., pp. 310 *ff.*
xx. 1, p. 311
xx. 11, p. vi
xx. 13, p. 66
xx. 16, p. 315
xxi. 1-21, pp. 317 *ff.*
xxi. 22-34, p. 320 *ff.*
xxi. 17 *b*, p. 24
xxii. 1-19, pp. 56, 323 *ff.*
xxii. 2, p. 179
xxii. 17, p. 330
xxiii., pp. 334 *ff.*
xxiii. 1, p. 121
xxiv. 7, p. 18
xxiv. 7, 40, p. 279
xxv. 3, pp. 90, 108
xxv. 6, p. vi
xxv. 18, p. 426
xxv. 25, p. 359
xxvi. 20, p. 290
xxviii. 22, p. 31
xxx. 14, pp. 47, 81
xxx. 14-16, p. 379
xxxi. 17-xxxii. 1, p. 32
xxxi. 29, 42, 53, p. 74
xxxi. 34, p. 32 (*n.*[1])
xxxi. 53, p. 66 (idiom)
xxxii. 2 *f.*, pp. 391 *f.*
xxxii. 4-22, pp. 393 *ff.*
xxxii. 23-33, p. 396 *ff.*
xxxii. 30, p. 401
xxxiii. 1-17, pp. 405 *ff.*
xxxiii. 18-20, pp. 407 *ff.*; cp. 534 (*n.*[1])
xxxiii. 19, p. 23
xxxv., pp. 416 *ff.*

xxxv. 1-15, pp. 416 *ff.*
xxxv. 2, p. 32 (*n.* 1)
xxxv. 7, p. 66 (idiom)
xxxv. 10, p. 402
xxxvi. 40, p. 353
xxxvii. 2 *ff.*, p. 435 *ff.*
xxxvii. 3, p. 436
xxxviii. 27-30, p. 357
xl. pp. 453 *f.*
xli. 40, 42 *f.*, p. 464
xliii. 32, p. 475
xlvi. 6-27, pp. 481 *ff.*
xlvi. 16, p. 92
xlvi. 28-34, pp. 485 *f.*
xlvii. 30, p. 491
xlviii. 16, p. 279
xlix. 5-7, p. 415
xlix. 9, p. 35
xlix. 25, pp. 18 (*n.* 1), 286

EXODUS

i. 8, p. 32 (*n.* 2)
iii. 2, p. 36
iii. 8, p. 84
iii. 14, p. 530
iii. 18, p. 531
iv. 18-26, pp. 533 *ff.*
v. 2, p. 32 (*n.* 1)
vi. 16, p. 265
vi. 25, p. 173
vii. *ff.*, p. 265
viii. 22, p. 544
ix. 13, x. 3, p. 32 (*n.* 2)
ix. 20, p. 32 (*n.* 2)
x. 21, p. vi
xii. 29-36, p. 326, 543
xiv. 2, p. 50
xv. 3, pp. 16, 58
xv. 26, p. 37
xvi. 34, p. 27
xix. 4, p. 8
xix. 18, p. 30
xxii. 19, pp. 28 *f.*, 69
xxiii. 20, p. 279
xxiii. 21, p. 5, 9 (*n.* 3)
xxiii. 31, p. 262 (*n.* 1)
xxv. 16, 21 *f.*, p. 27
xxv. 22, p. 26
xxvii. 21, p. 26
xxx. 6, p. 27
xxx. 13, p. 315
xxx. 17, p. 70
xxxii. 34, p. 60 (*n.* 1)

LEVITICUS

xvi. 8, 10, 26, p. 117
xvii. 7, p. 24
xviii. 3, p. 60
xviii. 21, p. 52
xviii. 23, p. 72

NUMBERS

ix. 15, p. 26
x. 35 *f.*, p. 19 (*n.* 6), 20
xi. 4, p. 546
xi. 5, p. 224
xii. 13, p. 37
xiii. 27, p. 84
xvi. 2, p. 546
xx. 5, p. 454
xx. 16, p. 60 (*n.* 1)
xxi. 15, p. 26
xxii. 1, p. 456
xxiv. 5, p. 457 (*n.* 5)
xxiv. 4, 16, p. 284

DEUTERONOMY

iii. 10 *f.*, p. 315
iii. 17, p. 26
iii. 24, p. 56
iv. 11, p. 30
iv. 49, p. 26
ix. 15, p. 30
xii. 2, p. 33 (*n.* 2)
xvi. 13-15, p. 18 (*n.* 4)
xvi. 21, p. 457 (*n.* 1)
xxviii. 68, p. 504
xxxii. 11, pp. 8, 9
xxxii. 17, p. 24
xxxii. 24, p. 58
xxxii. 33, p. 146
xxxii. 38, p. 50
xxxiii. 6, p. 500
xxxiii. 15, p. 512
xxxiii. 16, pp. 30 (*n.* 3), 510, 526
xxxiii. 17, p. 506 (*n.* 1)
xxxiii. 23, p. 58 (*n.* 2)
xxxiii. 24, p. 505
xxxiii. 26, 29, p. 284
xxxiii. 29, pp. 24, 284

JOSHUA

ii. 1, p. 19 (*n.* 1)
v. 13, pp. 19 (*n.* 7), 101
vi. 4, p. 107
vii. 6 *f.*, p. 134
x. 40, xii. 3, 8, xiii. 20, p. 26
xi. 4, p. 463
xi. 8, p. 193

JUDGES

ii. 1 *a*, 5 *b*, p. 417
ii. 13, p. 17
iii. 3, p. 50
iii. 11, p. 145
iii. 31, iv. 2, v. 6, p. vi (cp. 108)
iv. 2, pp. vi, 108
iv. 4 *f.*, p. 294
v. 17, p. 504 (*n.* 1)
vi. 3-5, p. 103
vi. 24, p. 46
vii. 12, viii. 10, p. 120
viii. 33, ix. 4, 46, pp. 18 (*n.* 4), 410
ix. 5, 18, p. 377
ix. 13, p. 78 (*n.* 1)
x. 6, p. 17
xi. 1, p. 19 (*n.* 1)
xi. 34-40, p. 326
xii. 6, p. 473
xiii. 6, p. 291
xiii. 19, p. 401
xiii. 20, p. 33
xiii. 24, p. 273

1 SAMUEL

i. 9, pp. 362 (*nn.* 2, 3), 503 (*n.* 1)
iv. 4, pp. 19 (*n.* 6), 20, 35 (*n.* 1)
iv. 7 *b*, p. 34
vii. 3 *f.*, p. 17
xii. 10, p. 17
xviii. 18, p. 98
xxvii. 8, pp. 121, 426
xxx. 9 *ff.*, pp. 119, 354 (with *n.* 3)

2 SAMUEL

v. 24, p. 100
vi. 2, pp. 20, 35 (*n.* 1)
x. 6, 8, p. 161
xiii. p. 445
xiv. 17, 20, p. 40
xxiii. 21, pp. 32 (*n.* 2), 327

1 KINGS

ii. 26, p. 34
iv. 14, p. 392
v. 10 *f.*, p. 40
vi. 29, p. 77
vii. 14, p. 44
x. 25, p. 261 (*n.* 2)
x. 28 *f.*, p. 463 (with *n.* 1)
xi. 5, pp. 17, 51
xi. 26, pp. vi, 44
xii. 28, p. xii
xiv. 31, p. 29
xvii. 8, p. 193 (*n.* 1)
xviii. 12, pp. 21, 33
xviii. 38, p. 30
xix. 11, p. 30
xix. 15, p. 62 (*n.* 2)
xx. 28, p. 31
xxii. 19 *ff.*, p. 20

2 KINGS

viii. 7 *ff.*, p. 62 (*n.* 2)
xiv. 7, p. 152
xiv. 14, p. 108

xvii. 30, pp. 18 (*n.* 3), 53
xviii. 4, p. 42
xix. 24, p. 172
xix. 37, p. 146
xx. 5, p. 37
xxi. 18, p. 55 (*n.* 2)
xxiii. 5, p. 19 (*n.* 2)
xxiii. 8, p. 24
xxiii. 13, p. 17
xxiii. 15, p. 51

1 Chronicles

ii. 9, p. 285
ii. 19, 50, p. 91 (*n.* 2)
ii. 44, pp. 23, 28
ii. 47, p. 479
iii. 23, iv. 4, p. 43 (*n.* 2)
iv. 26, p. 382
v. 1, p. 500
v. 6, 9 *f.*, p. 105 (*n.* 3)
vii. 12, p. 34
vii. 16, 25, p. 58 (*n.* 2)
viii. 22, p. 92
xxiv. 27, p. 93
xxix. 2, p. 465

2 Chronicles

ii. 1, p. 327
xi. 15, p. 24

Ezra

i. 10, pp. 452 (*n.* 2), 477
ii. 15, viii. 6 *f.*, p. 381 (*n.* 2)
ii. 41, p. 381
ii. 52 *f.*, p. 108
iv. 8, p. 273
viii. 18, p. 247

Nehemiah

vii. 33, p. 108 (*n.* 2)
vii. 57, p. 382
vii. 45, p. 146 (*n.* 2)

Esther

i. 1, x. 1, p. 168 (*n.* 2)

Job

i. 6, ii. 1, p. 16
i. 16, p. 33
iii. 8, pp. 6, 41
iv. 13, p. 73
vii. 12, ix. 8, p. 6
ix. 13, pp. 5 *f.*, 124
xv. 7 *f.*, pp. 13, 71
xviii. 14, p. 54
xxvi. 12, p. 7
xxx. 23, p. 206 (*n.* 1)
xxxi. 26 *f.*, p. 11
xxxiii. 15, p. 73
xxxiii. 23, p. 39 (*n.* 4)
xxxviii. 7, p. 16
xxxviii. 16, p. 39 (*n.* 2)
xxxviii. 19 *f.*, p. 10
xxxix. 19-25, p. 464

Psalms

viii. p. 3 (*n.* 3)
viii. 5, p. 71
ix. 21, p. 221
xviii. 10, p. 101
xxix. 10, p. 143
xxxviii. 16, p. 56
xlii. 7, p. 304
lxviii. 16 *f.*, p. 31
lxxii. 5, p. 273
lxxiii. 24, p. 113 (*n.* 3)
lxxiv. 13, p. 5
lxxvi. 4, p. 58 (*n.* 1)
lxxvii. 18, p. 57
lxxviii. 51, p. 32 (*n.* 2)
lxxviii. 68 *f.*, p. 31
lxxxi. 11, p. 5
lxxxix. 13, p. 117
civ. 3, p. 102
civ. 10, 14, 16, p. 36
civ. 15, p. 454
cvi. 33, p. 20
cvi. 37, p. 285
cxx. 5, p. 161 (*n.* 1)
cxxxvi. 37, p. 14

Proverbs

ii. 2, 3, 6, p. 75 (*n.* 8)
viii. 15, p. 131
viii. 22-31, p. 38; cp. 70
x. 1, p. 40 (*n.* 3)
xxiv. 3 *f.*, p. 75 (*n.* 8)
xxx. 1, xxxi. 1, p. 40 (*n.* 3)
xxx. 3, p. 75 (*n.* 8)

Ecclesiastes

xii. 11 *f.*, p. 40 (*n.* 3)

Canticles

vi. 13, p. 19 (*n.* 5)
vii. 3, p. 451
vii. 13 *f.*, p. 379
viii. 11, p. 387

Isaiah

ii. 2, p. 83
ii. 6, pp. 41, 162 (with *n.* 1), 376 (*n.* 1)
v. 1, p. 46
v. 20, p. 358 (*n.* 4)
vi. 4, p. 33
vi. 5, p. 51
vi. 8, p. 15
vii. 11, p. 36
vii. 14-16, p. 48 (*n.* 2)
viii. 1, p. 568 (*n.* 2)
ix. 4, pp. 29, 471
x. 4, pp. 29, 268 (*n.* 1)
x. 9, p. 332
xi. 1-9, p. 131 (*n.* 2)
xi. 11, p. 189
xiv. 12, p. 96
xiv. 12 *f.*, p. 85
xvii. 8, p. 25
xvii. 9, p. 195
xvii. 10, p. 50
xix. 9, p. 465
xix. 23-25, p. 32
xxi. 1, p. 30
xxiii., p. 193
xxvii. 1, pp. 5, 6
xxvii. 4, p. 348
xxvii. 9, p. 25
xxix. 1 *f.*, p. 47
xxix. 22, p. 286
xxx. 7, p. 6
xxx. 28, p. 358 (*n.* 4)
xxx. 30, p. 30
xxxiv. 5, p. 101
xxxiv. 11, p. 22
xl. 13, p. 20
xliv. 5, p. 105
xlv. 7, p. 10
xlv. 20, p. 35
xlviii. 16, p. 21
xlix. 10, p. 273
li. 9, p. 7
li. 10, p. 5
liii. (cult of dying god?), p. 57
liv. 9, p. 143
lv. 1, p. 85
lix. 4, pp. 4, 43
lxiii. 10, 11, 14, p. 20
lxv. 11, pp. 378, 472
lxv. 20, p. 510 (*n.* 1)
lxvi. 17, p. 377

Jeremiah

ii. 16, p. 290
iii. 12, p. 158
iii. 23, p. 18 (*n.* 2)
iv. 23, p. 22
v. 7, p. 19 (*n.* 1)
vi. 26, p. 56
vii. p. 18, 18
viii. 22, p. 41
x. 3, p. 11
xiii. 1-7, p. 91
xxv. 9, p. 187
xxx. 17, p. 37
xliii. 13, p. 273
xliv. 17-19, 25, p. 18
xlvi. 9, p. 109
xlviii. 45, pp. 109, 111 (*n.* 3)
li. 27, p. 146
li. 63, p. 91 (*n.* 3)

EZEKIEL

i. 4, p. 158
i. 10, p. 8 (*n.* 4)
i. 27, p. 15 (*n.* 3)
i. 28, p. 136
iii. 3 *f.*, p. 186 (*n.* 3)
viii. 12, p. 19 (*n.* 4)
viii. 14, pp. 19 (*n.* 3), 326
ix. 4, p. 105
xiv. 14, 20, p. 115
xvii. 13, p. 68
xvii. 22-24, p. 48
xviii. 28 *f.*, p. 56
xxvii. 3, p. 71
xxvii. 7, pp. 360, 436, 464
xxvii. 8, p. 193
xxvii. 16, p. 465
xxvii. 17, p. 475
xxviii., p. 116
xxviii., pp. 12 *ff.*, 116
xxviii. 2, pp. 72 (*n.* 1), 71
xxviii. 3, p. 96
xxviii. 12, 17, pp. 14, 71
xxxi. 3, p. 457
xxxi. 8, p. 94
xxxii. 21, p. 68
xxxii. 27, p. 121
xxxiii. 5, p. 360
xxxviii. 2, xxxix. 1, p. 39
xl. 2, p. 83
xli. 18, p. 77

DANIEL

vii. 13, p. 60 (*n.* 3)
ix. 27, xi. 3, xii. 11, p. 18
x. 4, p. 262
x. 13, 21, p. 60 (*n.* 2)
xii. 5, 6, 7, p. 456

HOSEA

i. 6, 10, ii. 3, p. 27
ii. 9-12, ii. 10, p. 61
ii. 15, p. 62
ii. 22, p. 60
iii. 1, iv. 17, p. 63 (*n.* 4)
iv. 6, 8, 12, p. 63
iv. 11, pp. 19 (*n.* 1), 26
v. 14, p. 35
vi. 1, p. 37
viii. 5, p. 62 (*n.* 3)
viii. 12, pp. 41, 63
viii. 13, p. 63
ix. 10, pp. 18 (*n.* 2), 63 (*n.* 4)
ix. 13, pp. 266 (*n.* 1), 268 (*n.* 1)
x. 14 *f.*, p. 395 (*n.* 1)
xi. 1-4, p. 61
xi. 10, p. 35
xii. 12, p. 357
xii. 14 *f.*, pp. 400, 402
xiii. 7 *f.*, p. 35
xiii. 15, p. 457
xiv. 4, p. 37

JOEL

ii. 20, p. 158
iv. 18, p. 85

AMOS

ii. 8, pp. 360, 412
ii. 10, iv. 25, p. xii.
iii. 12, p. 289
iv. 4, v. 21, p. 61
v. 25, pp. 31, 61 (with *n.*)
vi. 1, p. 26
vii. 7 *f.*, ix. 1, p. 56
viii. 14, pp. 18 (*n.* 3), 46 (with *n.* 2), 321, 401 (*n.* 1)
ix. 2, p. 36
ix. 3, p. 6
ix. 7, p. 12.

MICAH

v. 5, p. 182
v. 6, p. 304
vi. 4, p. xiii.
vii. 17, p. 82 (*n.* 1)

NAHUM

iii. 2, p. 463 (with *n.* 1)

HABAKKUK

i. 4, p. 332
i. 8, p. 463
ii. 18, pp. 67, 69
iii. 5, p. 58
iii. 11, p. 57
iii. 19, p. 260

ZECHARIAH

ix. 1, p. 91
ix. 14, p. 30
xii. 8, p. 47
xii. 10, p. 56
xii. 11, p. 326
xiii. 4, p. 360 (*n.* 2)
xiv. 5, p. 403 (*n.* 1)
xiv. 10, p. 83

MALACHI

iii. 20, p. 8

NEW TESTAMENT

MATTHEW

ii. 16 *ff.*, p. 516
iii. 9, p. 126

JOHN

v. 17, p. 70

1 CORINTHIANS

xv. 40, p. 81 (*n.* 2)

EPHESIANS

i. 6, p. 57

REVELATION

iv. 4, p. 16
xii. pp. 4, 5, 6
xii. 4, p. 139
xii. 6, 14, p. 268
xii. 7 *f.*, p. 37
xii. 15, p. 138
xxi. 10, p. 83
xxii. 1 *f.*, p. 78

APOCRYPHA, ETC.

2 ESDRAS

ii. 12, p. 78
ii. 19, pp. 83 (*n.* 1), 84

BARUCH

iii. 23, p. 40

ECCLESIASTICUS

xxiv. 8-12, p. 39

WISDOM OF SOLOMON

x. 7, p. 305

TOBIT

iii. 8, p. 46

PRAYER OF MANASSEH

v. 3, p. 6

ASCENS. ISAIÆ

iii. 17, p. 57

VIT. AD. ET EV.

36, 40, p. 78

APOC. MOSES

9, p. 78

BOOK OF ADAM AND EVE

pp. 81, 86

VISION OF PAUL

c. 21, p. 85
c. 23, p. 84

ENOCH (ETHIOPIC), BOOK OF

vi., xv., p. 117
xvii. 10, p. 134
xviii. 6-8, xxiv., p. 83
xxiv., p. 102
xxiv. 4, xxv. 5, p. 77
xxvi. 1, p. 94
xxxii. 3, 6, p. 75 (*n.* [8])
xlviii. 1, p. 115
xlviii. 1-3, p. 49
lx. 1, p. 116
lx. 7, p. 6
lxix. 6, p. 72
lxx., p. 115 (*n.* [3])
lxxi. 14, p. 49
lxxii. 1, p. 131

ENOCH (SLAVONIC)

viii., p. 75 (*n.* [2]), 78, 85 (*n.* [1])
viii. 5, p. 84
xix. 4, p. 12 (*n.* [1])

JUBILEES, BOOK OF

ii., p. 12 (*n.* [1])
iv. 23, p. 115
v., x., p. 146
viii. 12, 19, p. 94
x. 19-26, p. 203
x. 26, p. 206
xiii. 1, p. 220
xiii. 10, p. 222 (*n.* [2])
xxxiv. 1-9, p. 494
xl. 7, p. 467
On Gen. i. 26, p. 73
On Gen. iv. 26, p. 111
Omits Jacob's wrestling, p. 396

THE END

Printed by R. & R. CLARK, *Limited, Edinburgh.*

LAKE ERIE COLLEGE - LINCOLN LIBRARY
CIRC 296 C42
Cheyne, T. K. Traditions & beliefs of an
3 0356 0003 4044 8

LAKE ERIE COLLEGE LIBRARY
Date Due

DEC 16 1933
DEC 7 '53
MAY 23 '56
MAY 1 1958
FEB 24 1968
MAR 17 '71

296 Cheyne
C42 Traditions and beliefs of
ancient Israel 12724

DEC 6
DEC 3

297
431